

125100

JPRS-TAC-86-018

21 February 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

19980602 157

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

8
116
A06

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

21 February 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: SDI Brainchild of Military-Industrial Complex, Not Reagan (Aleksandr Pumpyanskiy; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 27 Oct 85).....	1
Team Concludes U.S. SDI Research Facilities Tour (Tokyo KYODO, 23 Jan 86).....	4
USSR's Abrasimov, Miki Discuss Disarmament, SDI (Tokyo KYODO, 30 Jan 86).....	5
Nakasone on Possible USSR Trip, SDI Participation (Tokyo KYODO, 29 Jan 86).....	6
USSR Views Disagreements in Western Europe Over Eureka (G. Deynichenko; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 15 Nov 85).....	7
More Polish Coverage of SDI Debate in FRG (Ryszard Drecki; Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU, 6 Jan 86).....	9

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

French Reject USSR Modernization Plan (Paris AFP, 31 Jan 86).....	12
France's Gen Gallois on USSR Disarmament Proposals (Pierre-Marie Gallois Interview; Rome LA REPUBBLICA, 22 Jan 86).....	13
Daily Sees Soviet Arms Proposal as 'Illusion' (Editorial; Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT, 17 Jan 86).....	17

NRC HANDELSBLAD Views Soviet Arms Proposal (Editorial; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 18 Jan 86).....	19
Abe Briefed on U.S. Stance on USSR Arms Proposal (Tokyo KYODO, 7 Feb 86).....	21
SALT/START ISSUES	
Soviet Naval Journal: Trident Has First-Strike Role (V. Kozhevnikov; Moscow MORSKOY SBORNIK, Nov 85).....	22
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
USSR Assails West's Response to Soviet Initiatives in Europe (A. Mozgovoy; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 13 Nov 85).....	25
Similarity of Initiative to 'Zero Option' Denied by USSR (Moscow Domestic Service, 24 Jan 86; Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 29 Jan 86).....	27
'Rational, Responsible Decisions' Urged	27
'Proposal is New in Principle'	29
Soviet Commentary Views France, UK Weapons Modernization (Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 31 Jan 86).....	30
TASS: NATO's Rogers Tries to 'Intimidate' West Europeans (Moscow TASS, 1 Feb 86).....	31
USSR: Settlement of European Disarmament Issues Possible (Moscow Television Service, 2 Feb 86).....	32
PRAVDA Editorial Article on European Aspect of Arms Problem (Moscow PRAVDA, 4 Feb 86).....	34
Dutch Party Leader on Cruise Treaty, Elections (Ria Beckers; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 11 Dec 85).....	38
Moscow Notes Dutch Protests Continue After Deployment Vote (V. Antonov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 3 Nov 85).....	40
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
USSR's Bogachev Decries U.S. Obstacles to CW Accord (Moscow TASS, 24 Jan 86).....	42
Soviet Training Methods Against Chemical Weapons (S. Geraskin; Moscow ZNAMENOSETS, No 9, Sep 85).....	44

USSR Journal Views Chemical Weapons Arms Race (G. Yevgenyev; Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN, No 1, Jan 86).	48
Australia's Hayden Criticizes Superpowers on Chemical Weapons (Melbourne Overseas Service, 5 Feb 86).....	57
Iraqi Military Spokesman Denies Use of 'Chemical Bombs' (Baghdad INA, 1 Feb 86).....	58

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR Views Expectations at MBFR Talks (Various sources, 29, 30 Jan 86).....	59
Soviet Envoy Addresses Meeting	59
Talks Center on Verification	60
MBFR Solution 'Taking Shape'	60
'Year Could Be Landmark'	61
USSR Views Disarmament Conference Session Held in Geneva (Moscow TASS, 3, 4 Feb 86; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 4 Feb 86).....	63
Session Opens	63
Conference Tasks Reviewed	63
USSR Official Cited, B.P. Prokofyev Interview	64

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S., Soviet Stances on Test Moratorium Vary (Georgiy Zubkov; Moscow Television Service, 23 Jan 86).....	66
PRAVDA's Zhukov Urges Positive U.S. Response to Moratorium (Moscow PRAVDA, 24 Jan 86).....	67
Time 'Running Out' for Moratorium Decision (Moscow TASS, 6 Feb 86).....	70
TASS Assails New U.S. Envoy to Finland for Zone Comments (Aleksandr Gorbunov; Moscow International Service, 23 Jan 86).....	72
USSR Paper Examines Problems of Nuclear Verification (Vladimir Katin; Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 23 Jan 86).....	74
USSR Hits Washington's 'Psychological Attack' on New Zealand (A. Mozgovoy; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 4 Dec 85).....	77
Moscow: U.S. Congressmen 'Pressuring' New Zealand (Moscow Domestic Service, 24 Jan 86).....	79

New Zealand Talks With Nuclear Powers About To Begin (Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD, 29 Jan 86).....	80
Nordic Labor Unions Urge New Nuclear Free Zone Conference (Carl Otto Brix; Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE, 17 Jan 86).	81
PRC Officials Meet Group for Nuclear-Free Pacific (Beijing XINHUA, 31 Jan 86).....	83
Briefs	
South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Consultations	84
USSR's Israelyan Test Ban	84
RELATED ISSUES	
USSR Commissions Consider Participation in 'Peace Year' (Moscow Television Service, 20 Jan 86; Moscow TASS, 20 Jan 86).....	85
Ligachev, Ponomarev Speak	85
'Text' of Statement	86
Caputo's Remarks on Disarmament, Reaction (Various sources, various dates).....	88
Caputo Speech Reported	88
Press Conference Held	88
Caputo on 'Immoral' Arms Race, by Maria Luisa Gonzalez	89
LA PRENSA Questions Caputo's 'Attitude', Editorial	90
Soviet Paper on Military-Strategic Parity (L. Korzun; MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 12 Nov 85).....	92
Soviet Commentaries Assess Recent Pentagon Budget Proposal (Various sources, various dates).....	97
'Hawks' Influence Apparent	97
'Staggering Sum' Requested	97
'Unprecedented' U.S. Rearmament	98
Joint Chiefs Urge Funding	99
Zholkver Comments	100
USSR's 2 February Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' (Moscow Domestic Service, 2 Feb 86).....	102
Stockholm Conference, MBFR Talks	102
Challenger Tragedy	105
USSR Academician Velikhov Evaluates Consequences of Nuclear War (Ye. Velikhov; Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 22 Jan 86).....	108
Briefs	
Goals of Geneva Disarmament Meeting	110

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: SDI BRANCHCHILD OF MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX, NOT REAGAN

Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Oct 85 p 5

[Article by Aleksandr Pumpyanskiy: "SDI Black Magic"]

[Text] The officially recognized inventor of gunpowder in Europe (1296) was the monk Berthold Schwarz, Berthold the Black, from Freiburg im Breisgau. However, 30 years before that, an event took place which is even more noteworthy. In 1267 the Franciscan monk, Roger Bacon, denying rumors that he practiced magic, sent to the Roman pope his own composition disproving magic, in which he wrote: "You can produce thunder and lightning if you take sulfur, saltpeter and charcoal, mix them and put them in a closed tube." This was actually gunpowder!

No, I am not making a case for Roger Bacon over Berthold Schwarz. After 700 years there is not as much interest in the facts as in the motives. The Oxford professor, philosopher and natural scientist in the Franciscan cassock struggled with magic and defended his good name with the methods and language of his era. This is not the single most important thing. It is the comprehension of the fact that the world turned out to be at the threshold of a tragic change in its fate. It wasn't long before people began to put this information into mass use: take sulfur, saltpeter and charcoal, mix it and put it in tubes. And since then, at least seven centuries of human history have been permeated with the smell of gunpowder.

But that is enough digression into the past. We have a very urgent reason to give some thought to the dangers of modern magic.

The White House is now passionately publicizing everywhere that it has dreamed up a true way to do good for mankind. The name of the magical idea is the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). For 2 years now, the political creators of SDI have been suggesting to Americans: Imagine that we would have over our heads an astrodome (or umbrella, or shield) which could not be penetrated by missiles. Wouldn't you sleep better?

It is an alluring idea. Who would object to security? True, scientists say that an impenetrable umbrella is a myth and that it is impossible to create it. The political creators of SDI do not argue with this. They are above the concrete facts. In Washington there are no scientists, only politicians;

that is, humanists and dreamers there are overshadowed and the politicians propose the "vision of the future" to Americans. A space shield, according to the rhetoric of the Administration, will make nuclear missiles "obsolete" and "outdated."

It is not customary to question miracle workers. A miracle is a question of faith and not reason. Woe to doubters, for doubt kills faith. But all the same to allocate one trillion dollars by the end of the second millennium after the birth of Christ and not ask one question? Certain timid questions have arisen of themselves among many sober Europeans and even absolutely loyal but pragmatic Americans.

And what kind of missiles does the Administration envision making "obsolete"? French and English? It is not likely that they ever so much as mentioned them in Washington.

Then, perhaps American? The statesmen there could be trying to penetrate their own nuclear magazine through the trapdoor of the future in order to once and for all destroy the dangerous, explosive arsenal. The concept is somewhat unexpected but, without question, courageous. One would wish to believe that they recognize that the "MX" and "Tridents" are monstrous weapons and it is impossible to live with such monsters any longer...

Alas, it is the reverse. The White House continuously emphasizes that it is supposedly vitally important to America to produce these aggressive thermo-nuclear monsters until the end of the century.

Therefore, what kind of missiles does it actually want to make "obsolete" and "outdated"? Soviet! In spite of the innumerable protestations to the contrary, they dream of a way to find strategic superiority over their opponent.

We observe that this is the foreign vision of a miraculous origin. Experience shows that for every SDI a "counter-SDI" will be found and it is necessarily more expensive. For every shield by which one hopes to render harmless a sword, a spear can be found which can penetrate that shield...

Buy the SDI! Verify this! This would guarantee the fulfillment of all their wishes!

Often during the 20th century, terrible things have been created in the name of progress. In one instant, Hiroshima learned the lesson well of the million-fold superiority of atom bombs over traditional TNT... If Londoners were not delighted with the progress of the Fascist "V-1" and "V-2," then that is strictly due to British conservatism... Missiles with multiple warheads are an achievement of even more advanced concepts than missiles with a single warhead.

At the White House they simply have no understanding of the possibilities which are opened by "Star Wars" technology. Only hopeless reactions can come to the way of progress. Western democracies and technocracies hurry to occupy a place in the near future of progress! Before it is too late...

Does Moscow propose a nuclear freeze and a moratorium on creation [sozdanie], research and deployment of space attack systems? First, this is "propaganda." Second, they, of course, describe themselves as "technologically behind." Third, the arms race is not important, the main thing is the race for the future. In short, through the thorns to the stars and so on and so forth.

Forget ethics, how can you ignore the cost! A trillion dollars cash just in American money. Militarized space. The breakup of negotiations. Arms race without end... Passively attempting to bargain.

To clarify, the trillions will go to the military-industrial complex. All the rest, including the possible radioactive fallout, will go mankind as the final cost.

In truth, only a sick society could plan to spend one trillion dollars over 10 years and call it a good thing. Only a very sick society could risk the fate of the earth for some profit--even for astronomical profit. The White House's "Strategic Defense Initiative" is cosmic metastasis of American militarism.

The miracle workers were exclusively the inventors. In part of the self advertising, they did not so much reveal secrets as they pushed them. Traveling salesmen do not produce the goods of their firm but they advertise them... Of course, Reagan himself did not think up the cosmic gunpowder. They only pinned the President's label to the idea of "Star Wars" while its secret author and undisputed master is the firm titled the military-industrial complex. The preemptory way with which the U.S. military-industrial complex places its appetites and ambitions over the general social problems is amazing. It is as if the inventor of the wheel would have had to immediately from the beginning construct a war chariot. It is as if, in reality, without a series of American militarist adventures, there would be no place for mankind to go and no place for them to use their intellect and money. Let there be plenty!

Why must the road to space lie through "Star Wars"? No, in progress there is a more direct, peaceful way. Any other position is crazy even if it is masked by the aura of science. It is not necessary to fear for the fate of scientists. Without the "Strategic Defense Initiative" they will not starve to death. At the end of the 20th century, it is time to recognize a simple truth: Progress is only progress when it reaches for a human goal. The path to the crown of thorns through the military stars is not even simply torture. It is death.

12747

CSO: 5200/1147

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JPRS-TAC-86-018
21 February 1986

TEAM CONCLUDES U.S. SDI RESEARCH FACILITIES TOUR

OW230405 Tokyo KYODO in English 0358 GMT 23 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, Jan. 22 KYODO -- The head of a Japanese delegation visiting the United States to tour Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) research facilities said in Washington Wednesday that the one-week tour has been useful in determining the problems involved in SDI development. Foreign Ministry official Ryoji Onodera, leading the second Japanese SDI team to the United States, said that the delegation was briefed in detail by U.S. officials on research and development plans. "As a result, we were able to get an idea of where the emphasis will be located in SDI research," Onodera pointed out.

Onodera, councillor at the ministry's Information Analysis, Research and Planning Bureau, and his team met and exchanged views with Lt. Gen. James Abrahamson, director of the U.S. SDI organization, and other U.S. officials at the Pentagon Wednesday.

The U.S. side repeated that Washington would welcome Japan's participation in the SDI research, according to Onodera. But the U.S. side made no particular mentions on what fields of technology the U.S. would want Japan's cooperation, he said.

Following their January 15 arrival in the U.S., the nine-member Japanese team toured private sector research facilities in Pennsylvania and California, as well as the U.S. military research complex in Alabama.

The second team, following the first Japanese delegation which visited this country last September to investigate mainly legal aspects of SDI, will immediately draw up a detailed report to be presented to Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone and ministry heads, according to Onodera.

/9274
CSO: 5260/036

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S ABRASIMOV, MIKI DISCUSS DISARMAMENT, SDI

OW301139 Tokyo KYODO in English 1135 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Tokyo, Jan. 30 KYODO -- Soviet Ambassador to Japan Petr A. Abrasimov Thursday met and briefed former Prime Minister Takeo Miki about a new three-stage nuclear arms control and disarmament proposal announced by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev January 15. Abrasimov called on Miki, president of the Dietmen's League for International Disarmament, at his private office to seek understanding of the Soviet proposal which calls for a total abolition of nuclear arms from earth by the end of this century as a final goal.

In response, Miki called for Soviet efforts to find some compromise in the current dispute over the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), saying that there would be no progress if the SDI issue continued to impede U.S.-Soviet talks on nuclear disarmament.

/8309

CSO: 5260/40

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

NAKASONE ON POSSIBLE USSR TRIP, SDI PARTICIPATION

OW291213 Tokyo KYODO in English 1206 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Text] Tokyo, Jan. 29 KYODO -- Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone told the Diet Wednesday that he is willing to visit Moscow if his talks with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev could help improve relations between Japan and the Soviet Union. Nakasone was answering questions posed by Japan Socialist Party (JSP) Chairman Masashi Ishibashi and other interpellators on a policy speech the premier delivered Monday. The House of Representatives session marked the opening of full-fledged debates on the national budget for fiscal 1986 starting April 1.

Asked about his Soviet policy, Nakasone said he wants to make tenacious efforts to improve Tokyo's ties with Moscow on the basis of the results of the recent visit to Japan by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. Japan-Soviet relations have been cool partly because of Japan's long-standing claim to four islands off Hokkaido, which were seized by the Soviets at the end of World War II.

Shevardnadze and his Japanese counterpart Shintaro Abe exchanged invitations for Nakasone and Gorbachev to visit each others country. "It will be Mr. Gorbachev's turn to visit Japan next, but I am ready to consider my visit to the Soviet Union (ahead of Gorbachev's Japan visit) if it is likely to produce significant results," Nakasone said. In 1973, then Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka visited Moscow for talks with the late Soviet party chief Leonid Brezhnev.

On the possibility of Japan participating in research on the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), Nakasone reiterated his previous position by saying that he will make a "careful decision" after seeing future developments.

Ishibashi urged the Nakasone administration to abide by a 1976 cabinet decision to hold down the country's defense budget below 1 percent of Gross National Product (GNP). Nakasone replied that he would like to respect and observe the policy. In the government proposed budget for 1986, national defense outlays amount to 3.34 trillion yen, representing 0.993 percent of the GNP estimated for the year.

During Wednesday's Lower House session, Nakasone was grilled also on fiscal and economic policies as well as the proposed move to correct the imbalance in the existing Diet seat distribution.

/8309

CSO: 5260/39

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR VIEWS DISAGREEMENTS IN WESTERN EUROPE OVER EUREKA

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 85 p 4

[Article by G. Deynichenko under the "International Commentary" rubric: "About 'Eureka'"]

[Text] Judging by the commentaries of the West European press after the intergovernmental conference in Hannover and especially after the consultation of the top representatives of France and the FRG in Bonn, it appears that "Eureka," the project for scientific-technical cooperation, is beginning to take form.

Indeed, in Hannover the representatives of 18 countries of Western Europe approved the declaration on the objectives and principles of cooperation in the area of advanced technology. In addition, they coordinated the first 10 projects for joint studies in this area. In Bonn, they were successful in bringing the positions of the FRG and France closer together in regard to the "Eureka" project, positions that previously were characterized by significant differences. It was even announced that at the December meeting of the heads of state and government of the EEC countries both countries will present joint proposals in the area of technological cooperation.

Based on the results of the Hannover conference and the Bonn meeting, the most ardent supporters of the "Eureka" project are already painting its enthusiastic adherents bright pictures of a future "European technological community" capable of bringing economic well-being and, in any case, even of successfully meeting the competition from the United States and Japan. At this time in the West European capitals, of course, no one is going to deny or even understate the scientific-technical and economic potential that the "Eureka" project can attain by remaining on the track of peaceful development. But it is hardly a time for rejoicing.

The fact is that the participants in the project, especially France and the FRG, the principal partners, were not able to resolve fully some disputed questions. And there are many of them, from the system of financing specific programs to the determination of their sequence. Despite the agreements reached in the course of the meeting between Chancellor Kohl and President Mitterrand, the attitude of the FRG toward the "Eureka" project is still one of reserve, if not skepticism. But what can one expect if there is not a

unanimous viewpoint on the "Eureka" project within the Bonn cabinet itself? Foreign Minister Genscher, for example, is more favorably disposed to it than Chancellor Kohl.

An important role is also being played by the circumstance that rightwing circles in the FRG, if one can judge by the recent statement of CSU leader F.J. Strauss, openly favor Washington's "Strategic Defense Initiative" and are inclined to view "Eureka" as some sort of supplement to it. In the words of a representative of the SPD parliamentary group in the Bundestag, the participation of the FRG in SDI has essentially "been decided." Let us recall that France, as opposed to the FRG, has refused to take part in Reagan's "Star Wars" program.

Under these conditions, the recent agreements between Bonn and Paris in regard to "Eureka" appear to be more of a tactical move designed to demonstrate their striving to work together in EEC matters in their own interests. This was alluded to very clearly by the Parisian LE MONDE, which pointed out that on the eve of the meeting of the heads of state and government of the EEC countries, the FRG and France would want to "create the appearance of progress" in their relations.

And what about the "Eureka" project? It is clear that it will continue to encounter difficulties and trials, at the heart of which lie serious differences of opinion of a political and economic nature.

9746

CSO: 5200/1211

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MORE POLISH COVERAGE OF SDI DEBATE IN FRG

Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 6 Jan 86 p 6

[Article by Ryszard Drecki, TRYBUNA LUDU correspondent in the FRG: "Interests and Ambitions"; first paragraph is TRYBUNA LUDU introduction]

[Text] The Bonn government decision to embark upon talks with the United States on the participation of the FRG in implementing "star wars" surely has not ended the controversy here over this issue. Essentially, however, the situation has become clear. DIE ZEIT wrote: "The federal government currently stands totally and entirely in favor of Reagan's space plans. Everything else is just decorative flourishes."

The "flourishes" refer to the text of the previously mentioned governmental resolution. It attempts to blur the essence of the issue and to have us believe that the talks are supposed to cover a technological "transfer" of broad scope, in which the SDI is only a small part; that it is merely a question of "research" on the SDI and not of the practical deployment of this weapon; that direct participation of the FRG as a state in work on the SDI is ruled out and that it is only a matter of the state's ensuring "framework conditions" for the participation of private West German firms. Even if this last point is true (nothing at all may be said for the two previous ones) then the assessment of H. Ehmke, deputy chairman of the SPD parliamentary faction that "the government is putting its hand to this in order to wind the arms spiral strongly once again" still holds.

Strong Objections

Controversy over participation in Reagan's program has lasted over a year on the Rhine. While "star wars" has not engendered the massive social protest that "missile rearmament" did here several years ago, objections from the "political class," the opinionmaking centers in a broad sense, have been very strong and numerous.

It is not only the entire parliamentary and nonparliamentary opposition--the Social Democrats, the "Greens," the peace movement and the communists--that has declared a decisive "no." The co-governing FDP together with Minister of Foreign Affairs Genscher also have expressed reservations. Even in the ranks of the ruling Christian Democrats, enthusiasm for participation in the SDI has been neither broad nor univocal.

Repeated emphatic warnings have come from the scientific world. Still in December, during a parliamentary "hearing" on the SDI, of 11 experts, 7 spoke out decisively against FRG participation, while only 2 were clearly in favor of it.

A certain reserve can even be sensed at Hardthoehe, the "Bonn Pentagon." It is said that both Minister of Defense Woerner and General Althernburg, general inspector of the Bundeswehr, would prefer to earmark forces and funds for projects that are suited more directly and practically to their own army.

If one takes a good look, it is evident that from the beginning, the only ones to declare publicly their unequivocal enthusiasm for participation in the SDI were Chancellor Kohl and a group of advisers, together with the extreme Christian Democratic Right (Dregger, Strauss). If, however, this "star wars camp" has succeeded in pushing through its own line, and at the expense of further severe internal clashes, a further reduction in the international prestige of the FRG and the introduction of snags into relations with some allies, e.g., France, then the question arises: What motives directed this camp, what forces stood behind them?

Officially, participation in the SDI is validated by the statement that research on this program "is beginning a new technological epoch" and that the FRG must join it if it does not wish to "lag behind in its general development." "I believe that arms development to keep us from lagging behind technologically is cynicism," replies Dr Werner Fuss, eminent laser specialist. Essentially, however, this "technological motivation" is not taken very seriously.

The Real Motives

In seeking the real motives of the Bonn decision, its critics here cite the statement of the well-known American politician George Ball, saying that in the United States, "the most effective support for 'star wars' is the greed of private businessmen." In the opinion of many Bonn observers, this view may be applied aptly to the situation in the FRG. There is much indication that the real decision on the participation of the FRG was made on 13 May 1985, at an evening meeting in the chancellor's office. Besides government representatives, participants in this meeting included the managers of such concerns as MBB, AEG, Dornier, Siemens, Standart Elektrik Lorenz and the like. They all look forward to certain possible benefits in "know-how" from taking part in Reagan's program, but primarily they anticipate staggeringly profitable orders. The hope for enormous profits by capitalist concerns has determined the stance of the FRG government on an issue of tremendous political and strategic importance. "The West German industry has its government totally in the palm of its hand," commented the "Greens."

By comparison with the interests of the "economy," other, political motives underlying the decision to take part in the SDI are considered secondary. "The Federal Republic will not gain any political or military benefits from this; the 'laser umbrella' is to shield only the area of the United States." (Here I quote the opinions of one of the Social Democrats). "If the fervor of certain politicians does not emanate merely from concern over the benefits

accruing to the owners of large enterprises, then in the purely political sphere, only certain practically irrational ambitions that are typical of the German Right can come into play." Example: the cold war satisfaction derived from taking part in "the largest armaments program of all time." Example: the well-known tendency of H. Kohl to ingratiate himself with "dear Ron" Reagan.

A certain importance also is ascribed to the hope that participation in the SDI will hasten the implementation of the FRG's own recently accelerated space program through certain technological affinities and practical applications. Last year, thanks to the aid of the American NASA, the "D 1" was realized. It was the first West German manned space experiment, essentially peaceful, but not devoid of certain military "business"; the "D 2" is planned for 1988. It surely is no accident that those that speak loudest for participation in the SDI are the same ones that spoke in tones of nationalistic boastfulness following the success of the "D 1," and that they already are calling the space flight center that has developed in Bavaria's Oberpfaffenhofen the "German Houston."

"As Quickly As Possible"

In January, Economic Minister Bangemann is to begin talks in Washington. According to government circles, Bonn wishes to "bring about their finalization as quickly as possible." Most likely it will succeed in this. Apparently the last open question is only the form of this finalization--the German government aims at some sort of loose form of international agreement, below the level of a formal pact, in order to offset criticism. Regardless of its form, the effect of such an agreement will be beneficial neither for the international situation nor for the FRG itself, say many people on the Rhine. The party colleague of Bangemann, Minister Genscher, exactly on the day before the 18 December 1985 government decision, said in an interview for one of the weeklies that the FRG "must offer its input into improving relations between the East and West." However, the interests and ambitions that have determined the participation of the FRG in preparations for the militarization of space work in exactly the opposite direction.

8536

CSO: 5200/3023

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRENCH REJECT USSR MODERNIZATION PLAN

AU311912 Paris AFP in English 1901 GMT 31 Jan 86

[Excerpts] Moscow, Jan 31 (AFP) -- France today rejected part of the latest Soviet disarmament plans which would ban the modernisation of British and French nuclear weapons, in a meeting here between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and French Finance Minister Pierre Berezogovoy. In a statement after the meeting Mr Berezogovoy said, however, that Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's proposals to destroy all nuclear arms by the year 2000 were "in the right direction". Mr Berezogovoy said France favoured a "global and regional balance of forces at the lowest levels possible." He said this should also be verifiable.

He added, however, that the French independent nuclear arsenal "has to be dissuasive" and make use of technical progress, so rejecting part of the Gorbachev plan calling for a non-modernization of British and French forces. Mr Berezogovoy said his meeting with Mr Shevardnadze had been "very warm" while TASS said it was "talks of a constructive nature." The French minister also met the new Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Boris Aristov and First Deputy Prime Minister Ivan Arkhipov as well as senior Soviet banking officials. French sources said that the talks concentrated on the possibility of developing bilateral trade as well as world money problems.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2629

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRANCE'S GEN GALLOIS ON USSR DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS

PM231536 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 22 Jan 86 p 13

[Interview with French General Pierre-Marie Gallois by Bernardo Valli in Paris; date not given]

[Excerpt] Paris--I asked General Pierre-Marie Gallois, the great nuclear strategy expert, whether the disarmament plan put forward by Gorbachev is credible and realistic.

"It is a very intelligent maneuver," he replied.

[Valli] Is it merely a maneuver?

[Gallois] With very generous and somewhat futuristic impulse Reagan said, in an attempt to justify his SDI (Star Wars) initiative, that its objective is the final elimination, in the long term, of nuclear weapons. To free mankind of that nightmare. That is what he said. Some months later Gorbachev declares himself in agreement. And he adds that he is ready for disarmament soon. Within a few years. Before the year 2000. And Reagan is forced to examine the proposal since he was the first one to put it forward. It is an interesting convergence between the two superpowers.

[Valli] But Gorbachev sets as a precondition the abandonment of the SDI project...

[Gallois] Just a moment. Let us look at the reasons that could have lain behind the proposal made first by Reagan, then by Gorbachev. There are two possibilities. Either both Reagan and Gorbachev are sincere or they are both trying to confuse matters. Let us first consider the hypothesis that they are sincere. In geopolitical terms it is being realized that the Soviet empire may stand to gain from ridding itself of nuclear weapons because its huge population resources grant it an overwhelming superiority in the field of conventional weapons. Furthermore it can always gradually replace nuclear warheads with conventional warheads...

[Valli] You mean use missiles as long-, very long-range artillery?

[Gallois] Yes. It would be an accurate artillery, good at hitting targets. Perhaps not very effective (as a deterrent). During the last world war, the 4,000 V2's fired at London did not have a great impact; anyway they did not alter the course of the conflict. Be that as it may, the Soviets could envisage their future security from this viewpoint and base their expansion on a combination of their superiority in conventional forces and the future artillery which they can proceed calmly to prepare, since this issue has not been raised.

[Valli] What about the U.S. side still assuming what you call the hypothesis of sincerity?

[Gallois] The United States too may really stand to gain from eliminating nuclear weapons. It has no borders with the Soviet Union and has a relatively powerful potential.

[Valli] What about the hypothesis of a mystification?

[Gallois] Reagan suggested his "star wars" when he realized he was suffering from a lag that was difficult to make up with respect to Soviet strategic weapons. It was easier to secure funds from Congress for a project that would indeed militarize space but that was portrayed as a possible way to achieve the elimination of nuclear weapons. This latter argument carries great weight with the Protestant and Catholic churches, which have mobilized against nuclear weapons.

[Valli] Gorbachev is not answerable either to Congress or to his public.

[Gallois] Gorbachev took Reagan at his word. The mystification arises when he makes his project subject to the abandonment of SDI. By so doing he is placing Reagan in a real predicament. The U.S. president has staked his prestige on that initiative, invested a great deal of money in it, and allocated many research projects to it. The idea of having a space shield has become more and more attractive. In other words, Reagan cannot abandon his SDI so easily. So Gorbachev can maneuver freely: He can promise wonderful things, imply that if they were accepted he would not actually suffer too much as a result... But since Reagan is so attached to his SDI...

[Valli] So, General, do you perceive no more than smokescreens?

[Gallois] It is a possibility. And if it is true, it will only be yet another proposal since the League of Nations first met in Geneva in the thirties. In other words, the Americans for domestic political ends and the Soviets for external propaganda purposes have put forward formulas that they have known to be unacceptable in order to perform prominent roles on the world stage. Reagan created a fine role for himself by saying that he wants to eliminate nuclear weapons. Gorbachev could not omit to do the same and has created his own.

[Valli] Gorbachev has divided his plan into two stages. The first envisages a 50-percent reduction over the next 5-8 years by the USSR and the United States of their nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territories and their retention of no more than 6,000 warheads on the remaining missiles.

[Gallois] In theory this first stage of the plan is possible, although one may have many doubts about it. Since 1972 the Russians have added 8,000 missiles to their arsenal. Then suddenly Gorbachev declares himself willing to scrap it all. A courageous decision. Feasible, in theory. Verifiable, too. But even with a reduction to 6,000 warheads a side the deterrent would remain frightening...

[Valli] Still, less than today.

[Gallois] The problem is that even with only 6,000 warheads a side the Soviets would still have a defense system that the Americans do not have. I am talking about the protection of Moscow, the construction of the big Krasnoyarsk radar system, and all the antimissile weapons which the Soviets are researching.

[Valli] And which the Americans do not have?

[Gallois] There is no protection for Washington. And the Gorbachev plan makes no mention of these systems. Basically, with 6,000 warheads the USSR can hit America but America, with 6,000 warheads, could not be sure of hitting the Soviet Union with the same force, since some of its weapons would be blocked by the defense system.

[Valli] The first stage envisages the complete elimination of the U.S. Euromissiles and Soviet medium-range missiles. Is this not the most important section?

[Gallois] Yes, the elimination of the Pershing 2's, the cruise missiles, and the SS-20's. Gorbachev's idea is the "zero option" which Reagan proposed 3 years ago and which I immediately criticized as dangerous--dangerous, because it makes no reference to the SS-21's, SS-22's, and SS-23's which the Soviets have deployed and whose range is 150, 500 and 1,000 km respectively, enough even to reach Italian territory. Those unlisted missiles are more dangerous than the SS-20's. They are situated in East Germany and Poland and pose a threat to the NATO forces as a whole. Gorbachev does not mention them.

[Valli] Indeed, they have been talked about very little.

[Gallois] And yet we are talking about 2,000 warheads that make it possible to destroy the armed forces selectively without hitting the cities. They would be valuable weapons in that first stage in a Europe free of Pershings and SS-20's. In that first period of the Gorbachev plan the USSR would be able to keep both Europe and America under fire, thus placing the West in a position of obvious inferiority.

[Valli] Despite this the Americans have not responded unfavorably. On the contrary...

[Gallois] How could they respond unfavorably if Gorbachev was taking up the two American proposals--the zero option and the long-term elimination of nuclear weapons? When a statesman commits a folly his adversary takes advantage of it.

[Valli] You are reducing everything to the level of a poker game.

[Gallois] No. It is simply a matter of a smart initiative taken by the Soviets, who are clever at exploiting U.S. political errors. The United States' verbal policy differs from its actual policy. Its entire foreign policy is dictated by domestic politics. In order for Reagan to be reelected or to be popular he is obliged to practice demagoguery. The Soviets have learned to exploit this. And they are right to do so.

[Valli] General Gallois. Your position perhaps partly reflects France's anxiety about some day witnessing the freezing of its own strike force, of which you were one of the promoters and inventors. The second stage of the Gorbachev plan speaks precisely of this.

[Gallois] In the second stage envisaged by the Gorbachev plan all nuclear powers should prepare to dismantle their arsenals, following the super-powers' example. But France and Britain, knowing disarmament is to occur between 1992 and 1993, will meanwhile have frozen their own arsenals to avoid wasting money from the moment the accord was signed. Europe will gradually become nuclear-free. Once the Pershings, the cruise missiles, and the SS-20's have disappeared, the elimination will gradually affect, in the second stage, missiles with a range of up to 1,000 km; the SS-21's, 22's, and 23's. And the same for the British and French missiles.

[Valli] After the third stage only conventional weapons will remain.

[Gallois] That means 60 divisions in the Central European sector. At that point the Europeans will have to tell the Americans that they are no longer needed: With no more nuclear weapons and only five conventional divisions, their presence in Europe would no longer be a guarantee. And the governments of Paris, Rome, The Hague, London, Brussels, Bonn, and Athens will be more understanding toward Moscow.

/9738

CSO: 5200/2626

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

DAILY SEES SOVIET ARMS PROPOSAL AS 'ILLUSION'

PM291037 Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 17 Jan 86 p 3

[Editorial: "Beautiful Illusion"]

[Text] Too good to be true. A nuclear weapons-free world by the year 2000, the goal of Gorbachev's latest scenario for the arms control talks between the two superpowers, seems an illusion. The development of ever more sophisticated nuclear arms is a result of the tension in many fields between the two superpowers, not the cause. As long as there is no reason to assume that these tensions will disappear in the next 14 years, Gorbachev's most recent plan can best be described as music of the distant future. Pleasant to hear but no more than that.

The arms talks between Washington and Moscow aim at the reduction of the military forces of both countries. Here nuclear arms play an important but not the only role. A world without nuclear arms, but with hefty arsenals of the latest conventional weapons with an unknown destructive power is not significantly safer than the present one. The partial reduction in the size of the U.S. and Soviet arms complexes would seem to be better served by a step-by-step approach than by the simplicity of a nuclear-free New Year's Eve in 1999. A simplicity which makes one think of the solemn agreements of the twenties in which total disarmament was announced on paper -- where anything is possible.

However, there is every reason to look at the subordinate clauses and to read between the lines of Gorbachev's proposals. A 3-month extension of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests is positive in itself. The reference to Moscow's readiness to allow on-the-spot verification of the dismantling of nuclear systems removes an important U.S. objection to agreements with the Soviet Union.

Moscow's readiness to come to a bilateral zero option in Europe in respect to the intermediate-range nuclear force [INF] could mean a breakthrough of the greatest importance in the Geneva talks which resumed this week.

But on this INF point the ambiguities in Gorbachev's text emerge. It is not clear whether Moscow is now prepared to view the cruise and Pershing-2 missiles as INF weapons as Washington wants. Up to now the Soviet Union has always taken as its point of departure that the Pershings and cruise missiles are strategic weapons, because they are able to reach targets in Western Europe, not targets in the United States.

However, of much greater importance is the tough condition that Gorbachev has laid down for the realization of his nuclear disarmament program: The United States must abandon its Strategic Defense Initiative. The initial reactions from Washington spoke of the careful study of interesting and encouraging aspects of Gorbachev's text, but as far as SDI is concerned the reaction is a brusque "no." The Reagan administration is not planning to halt the SDI project and as a result all of the Gorbachev timetable seems to fall to pieces.

To the extent that a blow is being struck in the complicated field of tension between Moscow and Washington to win over public opinion, it must also be said that Gorbachev has a better grasp of that part of the "game" and has succeeded in taking the master of public relations in the White House by surprise. This is a factor which should not be ignored but tactical gains in the field of public opinion do not mean that the battle surrounding arms control has been won on terms acceptable to the Soviet Union.

The cautious approaches by the Soviet Union seem primarily to have the aim of making it clear to the United States that good business can be done with Moscow if only that accursed SDI is relegated to the archives. And that will not happen at present, no matter how much one may regret it. And this means that a nuclear weapons-free world in the magical year 2000 is even more of an illusion.

/9738

CSO: 5200/2627

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

NRC HANDELSBLAD VIEWS SOVIET ARMS PROPOSAL

PM291349 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 18 Jan 86 p 9

[Editorial: "Signals From Gorbachev"]

[Text] The man who has a chance of seeing the end of this century from his present position has made public a blueprint for the relationship between states at the turn of the century. Party leader Gorbachev has his age and the traditions of the Kremlin in his favor if he is to continue to exert an influence on the course of events in the next 14 years.

It is a vision that he is holding out to the world -- a vision of mankind no longer confronted with the threat of nuclear arms. As if this were not enough, chemical weapons and other possible weapons of mass destruction would also be banned in this attractive prospect.

How the world would look without all these dreadful things but with the well-known rivalries intact is a question which General Secretary Gorbachev does not raise, but whose answer would not necessarily be wholly positive. However, this is not of immediate importance for since last year's summit at least new proposals are primarily intended in the Soviet mind to break the impasse in the arms talks.

Opponent Reagan reacted favorably to this most recent contribution from Moscow. He said that he was thankful and promised to study carefully various aspects of the proposal. This reaction was not entirely able to drown out the growls from the President's back room where his advisers analyze the Russian texts, but it was nevertheless a sign that Gorbachev's suggestions were not dismissed as old hat.

Reagan recalled that he had held out the same prospect years ago, but he adhered to his point of departure that without credible defenses making use of revolutionary methods it will be impossible to give up nuclear arms. In other words, in his view no situation is conceivable in which one power could not surprise the other with an attempt at annihilation. For this reason a protective shield will always be necessary. Gorbachev's spiritual "great step forward" is probably primarily intended to keep in step with his public image. However, the Russian reservations from before the summit have now become aims in themselves.

Thus, no construction work on Reagan's SDI must be carried out and nuclear tests planned in the framework of the development of U.S. space defense must certainly not take place. Thus, the French and the British must not modernize their nuclear forces and U.S. aid to the British nuclear power must be terminated. Thus, the "European zone" must be made free of nuclear arms.

But all these demands no longer seem to be linked together in a firm lump that can only be dissolved in an unreserved willingness to make concessions by the other side. Thus there can be talks about strategic weapons without SDI's being scrapped first. Reductions in the numbers of U.S. and Soviet medium-range arms can be the subject of negotiations while the British and the French are still considering the Soviet invitation. In addition, such negotiations do not need to begin with the withdrawal of the Pershing and cruise missiles from European soil, although the withdrawal of these weapons in the long term will have to be the outcome of these negotiations.

These signals from the Kremlin were becoming visible during the Geneva summit and were advertised even earlier when Gorbachev, on the eve of his meeting with the President, had meetings with members of the U.S. Senate and journalists from TIME. The fact that they have become recognizable in Gorbachev's variation of "I have a dream..." is encouraging. At any rate, a few obstacles seem to have been removed from the path of the official talks in Geneva which resumed this week.

/9738

CSO: 5200/2627

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

ABE BRIEFED ON U.S. STANCE ON USSR ARMS PROPOSAL

OWO70821 Tokyo KYODO in English 0806 GMT 7 Feb 86

[Text] Tokyo, Feb. 7 KYODO -- Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe Friday conveyed to the United States Japan's strong emphasis on Western unity and Asian security in connection with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's recent nuclear disarmament proposal. Abe also used the noon recess from Diet deliberations to tell special U.S. Envoy Edward I. Rowny that the United States should take the Japanese position into full consideration in formulating a counterproposal to the Soviet proposal.

A Foreign Ministry official said Abe specifically voiced concern about the Soviet Union's intermediate nuclear forces in Asia in his brief meeting with Rowny, a special adviser on arms control and disarmament issues to President Ronald Reagan and Secretary of State George P. Shultz.

The Abe-Rowny meeting was preceded by two hours of consultations between the two countries in which Rowny, special representative for negotiations in the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (USACDA), explained the American position on the Gorbachev proposal. Rowny and Vice Foreign Minister Kensuke Yanagiya led the U.S. and Japanese delegations to the consultations at the Foreign Ministry.

Gorbachev on January 15 called for the general elimination of nuclear weapons to achieve a total nuclear disarmament by the year 1999.

Although details of the U.S. briefing were withheld at the request of Washington, Rowny was understood to have outlined a number of potential U.S. responses to Moscow, possibly including USACDA's reported suggestion for a 50 percent cut in Soviet SS-20 missiles in Asia.

The Rowny mission, the Foreign Ministry official insisted, was "part of regular consultations" between the two allies on defense and military issues. But a ministry source said that the mission was extraordinary in that the Reagan administration is now mapping out a comprehensive counterproposal with unusual seriousness.

The Rowny delegation, which arrived in Tokyo Thursday night, will leave for China Friday night on an Asian swing which is expected to take it later to South Korea and Australia. A similar mission is in Western Europe for consultations with member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

/9738

CSO: 5260/042

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET NAVAL JOURNAL: TRIDENT HAS FIRST-STRIKE ROLE

Moscow MORSKOY SBORNIK in Russian Nov 1985 pp76-77

[Article by Capt 2d Rank V. Kozhevnikov: "The Trident--A First Strike Weapon]

[Text] Immediately upon entering the U.S. Navy inventory (1960), American nuclear missile submarines (SSBNs) began playing a noticeable role in the scenario of a new world war. This was reflected in the first SIOP (Strategic Integrated Operations Plan for hitting strategic targets) which called for delivering nuclear strikes against 200 of the Soviet Union's largest cities.

Twenty-five years have passed. This is a somewhat insignificant period for history, but very disquieting: It is characterized by a sharp qualitative and quantitative leap in the arms race and the creation of dangerous situations in the world through the fault of the American ruling circles.

In October 1981 Reagan announced his "strategic program" for the eighties containing instructions for further building up the offensive potential. In a strategic nuclear war there are plans to carry out massive (unlimited) and selective nuclear strikes against the potential enemy's installations on his territory; only selective strikes are planned in a limited nuclear war. Four strategic strike variants were developed: surprise, preemptive,¹ retaliatory-encounter, and retaliatory strikes. This was done so that the top U.S. military and political leadership could select any of them to correspond to the situation.

The next plan for striking strategic SIOP targets and the list of objectives to be destroyed included already more than 40,000 targets. They were broken down into four categories: nuclear forces (intercontinental ballistic missile launchers, medium-range ballistic missiles, SSBN bases, airfields for aircraft carrying nuclear weapons, command posts); general purpose military installations (airfields, troop deployment areas, and so forth); political and military centers (command and control centers, communication centers); and economic installations.²

The United States had created a huge nuclear weapon arsenal to destroy these targets--more than 10,000 weapons.³ More than one-half of them are located on SSBNs.

According to foreign press data, over 50 percent of the U.S. Navy's missile-carrying submarines are on constant patrol in the oceans of the world over an area of more than 14 million square miles.

The SSBNs patrol in secret at a depth of 30-40 meters and a speed of several knots. It is believed that the low level of noise and the secret mode of operation make them practically invulnerable to enemy antisubmarine forces. The patrol time for each missile submarine is 68-70 days, during which it almost continuously maintains a readiness for immediate use of its nuclear missiles.

The Ohio-class SSBN carries 24 Trident I missiles. Each one has 8-10 nuclear warheads with a yield of 100-150 kilotons. All this tremendous destructive force, more than 200 nuclear weapons, each having a TNT equivalent yield 7-10-fold greater than the bomb the Americans dropped on Hiroshima, is in the control of a few people.⁴

Striving to achieve military and technical superiority over the Soviet Union, the United States is devoting special attention to increasing the target kill accuracy and increasing missile warhead yield.

The United States has been working in this direction under the "counter-force" concept included back in the Poseidon program.

The Trident I, put into service on SSBNs in 1979, has the same target kill accuracy as the Poseidon (circular error probable of 450 meters), but has twice to triple the warhead yield. Trident II missiles, with which they plan to equip Ohio-class SSBNs beginning in 1989, will have 9-14 warheads each with a yield of up to 475 kilotons and a firing accuracy surpassing Poseidon missiles 4-5-fold. As a result, American experts estimate that the problem of hitting super-hardened small targets (missile silos in particular) will be resolved.

That is why, as foreign experts note, the Tridents are losing the nature of the "deterrent force" publicized by the Pentagon, and being turned into a first strike weapon. Here is what the British newspaper THE TIMES writes in this regard: "A distinctive feature of these missiles is their great accuracy. It is not needed for a retaliatory strike against major cities, on which the 'deterrence' concept is based. Such accuracy is required only if this type of weapon is intended to be used to destroy hardened silos in which each side has its missiles located... It is obvious, however, that the capability to destroy the silos remaining after the missiles have already been launched cannot serve as a means of deterrence... The only point in acquiring such a capability is to be able to deliver a preemptive strike against the missile launchers before the enemy has time to activate them. Thus, this weapon which they are trying to present as a factor for preventing war will become a means of provoking it..." One cannot but agree with this.

FOOTNOTES

1. A preemptive strike aimed at military objectives is called a "counter-force" strike; if aimed at nuclear weapons, it is called a "disarming" strike.
2. In the United States they are broken down into military industry (oil refineries, military plants, railroads, aircraft plants, and so forth), coal industry, and power stations.
3. Medium-range missile and forward-based cruise missile nuclear weapons are not included; the Americans classify them as strategic nuclear reserve forces.
4. There is good reason, therefore, that sensible Americans are again asking themselves: "Will an accidental nuclear war occur as a result of a group of individuals conspiring for some reason to launch nuclear missiles without the authorization of the U.S. President?" These concerns are not unfounded. Up to now, SSBNs are the only component of the U.S. strategic offensive "triad" which do not have an external safeguards against unauthorized launching of missiles.

COPYRIGHT: "Morskoy sbornik", 1985

12567/9738
CSO: 5200/1244

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

JPRS-TAC-86-018
21 February 1986

USSR ASSAILS WEST'S RESPONSE TO SOVIET INITIATIVES IN EUROPE

Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Nov 85 p 5

[Article by A. Mozgovoy: "'Tomahawks' Policy: Before the Geneva Meeting-- Arguments and Facts"]

[Text] Two years ago, a Starlifter military transport aircraft of the U.S. Air Force brought the first batch of American Tomahawk cruise missiles to the British air base of Greenham Common. Thus began the practical implementation of the decision of the NATO Council to deploy 572 American intermediate-range nuclear missiles on the soil of a number of Western European countries.

The deployment of the American missiles not only greatly complicated the situation on the European continent but also aggravated the entire international situation. The Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe and the negotiations on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms were disrupted.

The Pershing 2's and Tomahawks that the United States is bringing into the Old World are strategic weapons in relation to the USSR. The United States is counting precisely on an increase in its strategic potential and thereby on the achievement of unilateral military advantages. In addition, Washington has clearly set for itself the goal of turning Europe into the main theater of nuclear war so as to shift the flame of an all-destructive conflagration away from its own soil, to the extent that this is possible. These plans, of course, are illusory. Our country has sufficient capability to counteract the growing American threat.

But we are opposed to a worsening of the military and political confrontation. We are in favor of an equal dialog leading to disarmament based upon the principles of equality and identical security. That is why the Soviet Union has undertaken a number of steps directed toward the establishment of favorable conditions for the reduction of the level of nuclear confrontation, including in Europe. Thus, in April of this year, the USSR unilaterally placed a moratorium on the deployment of its own intermediate-range missiles and stopped the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe. In the European zone, the Soviet Union reduced the number of its SS-20 missiles to 243 units, that is, to the level of June 1984, when the additional deployment of Soviet missiles was begun in response to the deployment of American

intermediate-range missiles in Europe. Finally, our country expressed its willingness to conclude a separate agreement on intermediate-range nuclear weapons in Europe with no direct link to the problem of space and strategic arms.

How did the West respond to the constructive Soviet initiatives?

At its October session, the NATO Nuclear Planning Group confirmed the course of the accelerated deployment of American "Euromissiles." At the beginning of this month, the Government of the Netherlands went against the opinion of the majority of the country's populace and declared its acceptance of 48 American Tomahawks on Dutch soil. Whereby The Hague found no better way to justify this irresponsible decision than to resort to a lie: supposedly the USSR has not recently reduced but increased the number of SS-20 missiles in the European zone.

It is clear who is voicing the slander in the Netherlands. In an interview with Soviet journalists, the American president himself asserted without batting an eye that the Soviet Union has deployed 441 SS-20 missiles. But quite recently the USSR Ministry of Defense officially declared: "The number of SS-20 missiles in the European zone of the USSR is 243, and in the territory of the USSR as a whole there are significantly fewer SS-20 missiles than the number of 441 such missiles cited by NATO."

Washington and its NATO partners needed the false numbers to discredit the Soviet Union prior to the summit meeting in Geneva and to weaken the influence of its peace-loving foreign policy on international public opinion. But the peoples of Europe are tired of NATO falsifications.

9746

CSO: 5200/1211

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SIMILARITY OF INITIATIVE TO 'ZERO OPTION' DENIED BY USSR

'Rational, Responsible Decisions' Urged

LD241413 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Gennadiy Shishkin commentary]

[Text] Europe deservedly enjoys the glory of the old center of world civilization and progress in all areas of human activity, a continent where the first industrial revolution took place and where the majority of outstanding discoveries were made, where a socialist revolution was carried out for the first time. Europe accounts for approximately 47 percent of the entire world national income and about 50 percent of world industrial output. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that in the history of the European Continent there has been an endless number of small and big wars, including two world wars.

It is true that Europe has been at peace for over 40 years now, but it is an armed peace. There are enormous stocks of nuclear and conventional weapons concentrated on the territory of European countries and still the explosive concentration of the latest means of human destruction is growing. New giant programs of weapons and very dangerous strategic concepts are being developed and implemented, although Europe is simply too small and too fragile for a policy of force.

But for Washington it is someone else's home, a battlefield on the maps of the strategists. In putting forward a concrete plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons, our country proceeds from the assumption that Europe is our common home, that ensuring security in it is the common vital cause of all Europeans. The Soviet Union has long been insistently striving for the full liberation of Europe from nuclear weapons. A new, very big and, of course, bold step has not been made in that direction.

The program put forward in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, for a total and all-embracing elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 envisages in the first stage -- that is, over a period of 5 to 8 years -- the elimination of all medium-range ballistic and cruise missiles belonging to the Soviet Union and the United States in the European zone. This will be possible, of course, if the United States undertakes the obligation not to supply its medium-range strategic missiles to other countries and if Britain and France do not increase their corresponding nuclear weapons.

As we see, the Soviet Union has taken a substantial step toward meeting the Western powers, which for a long time had been sabotaging a solution to the task of eliminating medium-range missiles under the pretext that the Soviet Union was allegedly aspiring to put its SS-20 missiles outside the framework of the reduction. Now even THE NEW YORK TIMES states that the proposal to destroy U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe at the first stage is "most interesting." At the same time, THE NEW YORK TIMES obviously fed by the Washington administration, is striving to create the impression that this would supposedly be a change in the former Soviet position. The paper asserts that the impression is being created that the Gorbachev proposal is approaching the zero option proposed by Reagan.

This is, of course, an attempt at overt falsification, an attempt to impose on the Soviet Union the Reagan zero option, which is totally unacceptable to it. After all, zero, as Reagan would have it, on the one hand envisaged that the Soviet Union should destroy its medium-range missiles not only in the European zone, but also in the east of the country; on the other hand, it excluded neither a U.S. turnover of such missiles to its allies nor an increase in their corresponding nuclear weapons by Britain or France.

In trying to cast a shadow on the concrete and precise Soviet proposals and to discredit them, the opponents of nuclear disarmament in Europe are asserting that, supposedly, the elimination of Soviet missiles in the European zone does nothing, since SS-20 missiles can be transferred to Europe from Asia. But it is clear to any unprejudiced person that the Soviet missiles are situation in the east because the United States has nuclear weapons capable of reaching the territory of the Soviet Union in that region and not at all for moving them here and there.

All these inventions and excuses -- you could dream up as many as you like -- serve only one aim: to deflect negotiations from solving the question of the elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe. Under the guise of a so-called global approach on medium missiles, the United States would like to simply not allow accord. The Soviet program solves the question of medium-range missiles, including the east, while in 15 years there would be no missiles at all if this program were to be fulfilled.

As yet another confirmation of the seriousness and sincerity of its intentions and its readiness to move as quickly as possible to practical deeds on strengthening peace and ridding Europe and all mankind of the threat of nuclear war, the Soviet Union has made the decision to extend the moratorium which is announced on all nuclear explosions for another 3 months and has called on the United States, and then the other nuclear powers, to join it. After all, the extension of the moratorium is not a simple decision for the Soviet Union. It cannot display unilateral restraint in relation to nuclear tests indefinitely. But the stakes are too high, the responsibility for the fate of the world is too high not to try all possibilities of exerting the force of example on the positions of others.

The United States is being given extra time to analyze the whole complex of the Soviet proposals. The peoples expect and demand a serious approach from Washington. The U.S. side's pursuit of the chimera of military superiority is a fruitless and dangerous policy. The Soviet Union proposes entering the path of rational and responsible decisions.

'Proposal is New in Principle'

LD292250 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 29 Jan 86

["Transcript" of studio discussion with Doctor of Law Vadim Sobakin and Dr Lev Semeyko of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute, moderated by Nikolay Borin, not further identified]

[Excerpts] [Borin] My first question is related to the first stage of a 15-year plan for eliminating nuclear weapons proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev in his statement. The Soviet Union, as you know, has said before that it is in favor of eliminating nuclear weapons and it has proposed ways of setting up a nuclear-free zone in Europe. As we can see from Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, the problem of nuclear disarmament in the next 5-8 years will be related very closely indeed to European issues. So what in your view is the new element in the Soviet proposal providing for both the Americans and the Soviet Union to renounce their nuclear forces in Europe? The question to you, Dr Semeyko

[Semeyko] Mikhail Gorbachev paid special attention to Europe in his statement because the troop concentrations of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO are at a maximum here. Besides the nuclear weapons held by the Soviet Union and the United States in Europe, there also are considerable British and French nuclear forces accounting for a quarter of NATO's delivery vehicles. Britain and France are planning to increase the number of their warheads to 1,200 in the nineties.

[Borin] Some people in the West are claiming that actually the Soviet Union has copied what was termed the zero option proposed by President Reagan back in November 1983. So what can you say about that, Dr Sobakin?

[Sobakin] That is not correct. Our proposal is new in principle. President Reagan's proposal boils down to eliminating Soviet medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe and Asia and stopping at that. In our new proposal we consider the issue of eliminating Soviet and American missiles as an integral part of nuclear disarmament as a whole. Another important distinction is that President Reagan did not propose that British and French nuclear forces be frozen, nor did he stipulate that the USSR and the United States should not transfer their technology and nuclear weapons to other nations.

[Borin] Now is there any connection between the proposal for freezing nuclear weapons in Western Europe and renouncing further deployment of these weapons there with the proposals made by Mikhail Gorbachev at the Paris and Geneva summits for bilateral talks between the USSR and France and Britain?

[Semeyko] Mikhail Gorbachev proposed consultations that may, if any progress is achieved at them, become talks. If Britain and France do not want nuclear weapons to explode on their territories, if they are interested in survival and eliminating nuclear weapons, such consultations could start now. Perhaps an agreement could be reached whereby Britain and France would not build up their nuclear forces while American and Soviet medium-range nuclear missiles are reduced.

This would pave the way to the success of the first stage of eliminating nuclear weapons in Europe.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1246

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET COMMENTARY VIEWS FRANCE, UK WEAPONS MODERNIZATION

LD010013 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 31 Jan 86

[Sergey Sayenko commentary]

[Text] Britain intends installing 64 new Javelin missiles in its nuclear submarines under the program for modernizing its nuclear force. Here's commentary by Sergey Sayenko, and this is what he writes:

The Javelin missiles mark the start of the program. In the near future, 16 more sophisticated United States-made nuclear missiles, Trident II, are to be installed in four British submarines. France has also begun installing missiles with multiple warheads in its submarines. France doubled its arsenal of submarine-launched nuclear missiles having launched its inflexible submarine carrying 16 missiles last year, each having 6 warheads. France has doubled its number of submarine-based nuclear missiles. By the end of the modernization program Britain and France will have more than a thousand warheads. The present nuclear potential of the two countries, however, cannot be disregarded.

In this connection, the Soviet Union has on many occasions proposed to the European nuclear powers that bilateral talks be opened on the issue of nuclear balance in Europe. The Soviet Union said it's prepared to give detailed consideration to the security interests of Britain and France. These talks are not an end in itself as far as the Soviet Union is concerned. In his statement of 15th January, Mikhail Gorbachev proposed a step by step program for ridding the earth, naturally including Europe, from all nuclear weapons until the end of the century. Under that program over the next 5-8 years, the Soviet Union and the United States are to reach and implement an agreement on scrapping their medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. At the same time, according to the Soviet proposal, the United States and the Soviet Union should reduce their missiles capable of reaching their respective territories by 50 percent.

Meanwhile, Britain and France will pledge not to build up their nuclear forces. The Soviet Union proposes that by the year 1990 the other nuclear powers, including Britain and France, join nuclear disarmament so that by the year 2000, nuclear weapons are banished from the face of the earth.

The Soviet plan for total nuclear disarmament accounts for the security interests of all nations, including the nations of Europe. Naturally the implementation of that plan will require active participation not only of the USSR and the United States but other nations as well, including primarily the nuclear powers.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1246

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: NATO'S ROGERS TRIES TO 'INTIMIDATE' WEST EUROPEANS

LD011721 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 1 Feb 86

[Text] New York, February 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Setunskiy reports: The answer of the NATO military to the Soviet programme for ridding the world of nuclear arms is a speedy build up of the latest systems of nuclear arms. U.S. General Bernard Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander -- Europe, declared this bluntly in an ASSOCIATED PRESS interview. He announced the plans to start the deployment of new, "more effective" tactical nuclear missiles in Western Europe after 1988. The general stressed that this will be part of the implementation of a broad programme of the "modernisation" of NATO nuclear arsenals planned for the period of 1988-1995. Rogers explained that the "modernisation" envisages the replacement of "obsolete" nuclear missiles now deployed in central Europe with new missiles that are more precise and have a greater range. He also came out with an "initiative" for the development and production of new "air-to-ground" nuclear missiles to equip the NATO air force with them.

Touching upon the Soviet programme of the elimination of all nuclear arms, the NATO supreme allied commander-Europe asserted, as if in mockery of common sense, that it is "potentially dangerous" for Western Europe. Specifically, he said that in no case should the Washington administration agree to the Soviet proposal for the complete elimination at the first stage of the medium-range missiles of the USSR and the USA, for, he said openly, this would weaken the United States strategic nuclear umbrella. But what horrifies the NATO chief most of all is the prospect of the world being rid of nuclear weapons altogether, and hence of the threat of nuclear annihilation. He tried to intimidate Western Europeans by declaring that in that case the Soviet Union would, allegedly, have the advantage in conventional arms. He demanded in an ultimatum form that nuclear weapons be preserved. Rogers admitted that the course of the Pentagon and the NATO top echelon at the speeding of nuclear rearming might come up against difficulties, in other words, against the further growth of the anti-nuclear, anti-war movement in Western Europe, protests of the broad public of those countries to which the U.S. Administration assigns the role of nuclear hostages. It follows from his statement that next week NATO high officials will set out for West European countries to exert efforts to push through their militaristic plans.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1246

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

JPRS-TAC-86-018
21 February 1986

USSR: SETTLEMENT OF EUROPEAN DISARMAMENT ISSUES POSSIBLE

LD022032 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 2 Feb 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by APN political observer Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Excerpts] Goods are purchased when the demand for them arises. Advertising and fairs are intended to stimulate demand which objectively need not exist. For instance, people have no objective, biological need to smoke and drink. People smoke and drink to satisfy falsely acquired needs. The same goes for weapons. Canada and even the United States have no objective need for powerful weapons: No one is preparing to attack them. But they have to trade in arms. True, there is a depraved need to use weapons for imperialist policy. But this reason -- the real one -- is concealed and a false reason is spoken aloud -- the Soviet threat. They are always saying it. Now more than ever before, however, Western reason has grounds to doubt this. The thesis about the Soviet Union is currently hard to defend: A country which is putting forward a concrete plan for nuclear and other forms of disarmament cannot remain a threat. Washington itself promised to make a serious study of the Soviet initiatives. This study, however, is being delayed. And Senator William Proxmire considers the continuing official silence -- as he described it -- as shocking evidence of weakness. On the other hand, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has just described relaxation of tension as a childish hope.

Thus, time passes in polemics, although observer James Reston writes that the way President Reagan deals with the Soviet proposals may be, according to Reston, a major decision in his presidency. All the same, it is reported that the letter which the White House is preparing to send to the Kremlin will lay emphasis on the medium-range missiles in Europe. The President will allegedly declare in the letter that the Russians should discuss their proposals with Britain and France so that these two countries promise not to increase their forces within the framework of the medium-range missile treaty.

Well, the European side of the Soviet plan can be dealt with without delay -- without dragging the matter out and hampering it with other problems. If it were possible to eliminate the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles on the European Continent one of the difficult knots in world politics would be united. It is suggested only that the reasonable Soviet desires should be taken into account, that the United States should not hand their medium-range missiles on to their allies, and that Britain and France should not increase their own nuclear weapons.

Western Europe has the opportunity of putting in its own word. Do they want U.S. missiles here, in their own home? Europe is our common home and conditions have now arisen here for the estrangement between East and West to be overcome. Nothing is demanded of Britain and France that they would not themselves declare. Formally, their nuclear forces accord with the principle of minimal restraint. From the point of view of this principle they now have enough of these forces and there is no necessity to augment them. That would go directly against the moods and hopes which gripped Europe following the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva and following Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement.

These moods and hopes can be felt both in Geneva and Vienna, and Stockholm, also. An international conference of nongovernmental organizations, Together for Peace, has been held in Geneva, incidentally, which addressed a call to all people to undertake joint efforts to see that mankind enters the next century in peace.

The latest round of negotiations on the mutual reduction of armed forces and weapons in central Europe has opened in Vienna and it opened on an optimistic note.

In Stockholm the latest session of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and disarmament in Europe has also opened on an optimistic note. This is the ninth session already and, perhaps, the first with such great hopes for success. In the final stage of the eighth session, there was positive mention of the influence of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva and at the beginning of the ninth session Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement had a beneficial effect.

Dumas, French minister of external relations, spoke at the first session. He described the Soviet initiatives as a step in the right direction. But what about the direction of French steps? Paris is for the time being not ready for concrete talks and sets out the conditions for taking part in talks. One is a substantial cut in Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals. But the Soviet Union is in favor of such a cut; it is also in favor of the total liquidation of these arsenals. The other French condition is the renunciation of creating [sozdaniye] destabilizing antimissile defense systems. The Soviet Union is also in favor of such a renunciation; it also sees in these an obstacle which should not be created. France is also in favor of chemical disarmament. Finally, France is against a lack of equilibrium in conventional weapons in Europe. But the Soviet Union also has no need for such a lack of equilibrium: our proposals take the interests of the security of all in account.

On Friday, a reply to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's appeal was received from French President Francois Mitterrand. President Reagan is still writing.

FRG Foreign Affairs Minister Genscher also spoke at Stockholm. He also found good words to say about the Soviet initiatives and promised to draw up constructive responses to constructive elements.

So, negotiations are underway in Stockholm, Geneva, and Vienna: Mankind lives in hope.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1246

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON EUROPEAN ASPECT OF ARMS PROBLEM

PM031651 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[Editorial article: "The European Aspect"]

[Text] The program for the phased total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere on earth by the year 2000, with a ban on space strike arms, which was put forward in the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was received and is being discussed in Europe with exceptionally great interest. There have been responses of one kind or another by the governments of all the continent's states, their political forces, and the broadest circles of the public, antiwar movements, and the mass media. The European response is like a barometer reflecting the general weather of sentiments in the world. At the same time its resonance is clearly intensified by the "specific continental features." Namely, the European aspect of the nuclear problem.

This problem has been under discussion for many years. But as yet there have been no positive developments. On the contrary, security conditions on the continent are becoming worse and worse. And this dangerous development is taking place where both world conflagrations broke out and where the two mightiest military groupings face each other with their large arsenals of nuclear arms.

The notorious NATO "arms upgrading" program gave rise to a further buildup in these arsenals. Hundreds of new U.S. medium-range missiles have been installed in a number of West European countries. Contrary to the arguments of common sense and the national interests of the European peoples, the process of siting these first-strike weapons continues to this day. Naturally, this course of events is causing extreme concern among the peace-loving public and sensible political forces on the European Continent.

It is time to cut the Gordian knot and find a way out of the impasse. The European aspect of the Soviet nuclear disarmament plan proposes just such a bold, radical solution.

It is a question of achieving and implementing, in the first stage of the plan's implementation, a decision on the total elimination of the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone -- both ballistic and cruise missiles. And it is a question of doing this as a first step on the path toward the complete liberation of Europe from nuclear weapons.

The exceptional importance of this proposal both for Europe itself and for the whole world is obvious.

"If it was possible, without delay and without weighing the matter down with other problems, to eliminate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles on our continent," M.S. Gorbachev noted, "We would, perhaps, have untied one of the most complex knots in present world policy and, to a considerable degree, cleared the way for a radical reduction in nuclear weapons and finally, their complete elimination."

In the European salient also, the Soviet initiative defines clear routes, guidelines, and concrete time frames. It takes into account the arguments and concepts put forward by the other European nuclear powers and the nuclear realities on our continent in general. In this connection many West European and also, in part, U.S. commentaries note not only its constructive nature, but also its genuinely innovative approach to the problem and practical suitability for attaining the great goal of liberating European soil from nuclear weapons.

There are precise time frames for the first step along this path. The elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone should take place within the period provided for by the first stage of the Soviet plan. And the relevant medium-range should be not merely "removed," but specifically destroyed. This would, therefore, be a real, cardinal measure toward nuclear disarmament in Europe, as a result of which there would be several hundred fewer missiles and more than 1,000 fewer of the corresponding charges here and indeed, in the world as a whole!

An important feature of the Soviet plan is that at the first stage it is oriented, first and foremost, toward the Soviet Union and the United States. Neither the French nor the British nuclear forces are included in the "Soviet-U.S. list" [vedomost].

However, it would be logical, in the course of resolving the question of eliminating medium-range missiles, for the United States to make a commitment not to deliver strategic missiles or medium-range missiles to other countries and for Britain and France not to build up their corresponding nuclear arms.

It is no secret that the nuclear potential of France and Britain is increasing rapidly. Given radical reductions in the corresponding Soviet and U.S. arms, this potential would account for an even more substantial "share" in the general balance of forces, particularly the European balance. As THE WASHINGTON POST observed the other day, "as the number of nuclear missiles belonging to all the nuclear powers comes closer together, it will become increasingly difficult to claim that the British and French deterrence potentials are small, special forces with no influence on the overall correlation of forces."

Official statements that France and Britain will be prepared to join in the nuclear disarmament process only after a substantial reduction in the nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States are well known.

In view of this it is proposed that other countries begin to reduce their nuclear arms only at the second stage, after the Soviet Union and the United States have reduced -- and not merely substantially, but radically, by half -- their nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory. Moreover, under the Soviet proposal, the reduction in the other countries' nuclear arsenals would begin with the destruction of tactical weapons at the second stage, while those nuclear arms which they themselves describe as strategic would be destroyed only at the third stage, simultaneously with the completion of the elimination of the Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals.

The Soviet program for Europe as a whole is drawn up in such a way that its implementation would not be detrimental to anyone's security at any stage. That is its great strength.

Europe is the common home of all the peoples inhabiting it, including the Soviet people. We have a vital interest in ensuring security and good-neighborliness there. Soviet efforts to eliminate the main -- nuclear -- threat on the continent are particularly persistent. Setting an example of goodwill, the Soviet Union unilaterally removed the SS-20 missiles additionally deployed in the European zone from operational readiness and dismantled the corresponding fixed installations for these missiles. The proposal made earlier by the Soviet Union to free Europe entirely from both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons remains valid.

During the Soviet top-level visit to France last October an important proposal by the Soviet Union was made public. It is aimed at facilitating an accord on the speediest mutual reduction of medium-range nuclear means. It provides for the possibility of concluding a corresponding agreement separately, unconnected with the problem of space and strategic arms.

It was then that the Soviet Union voiced its readiness for a direct discussion with France and Britain about nuclear affairs. The idea of an interim agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe was discussed at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva, when points of contact in this sphere were detected. What we have here is a broad panorama of ideas, proposals, and approaches advanced by the Soviet Union to resolve the fundamental problem of European security. It attests to the sincerity and earnestness of our intentions.

There is no doubt, however, that the proposal to liquidate the Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone is now assuming special significance. Given the sides' corresponding will, it can easily be implemented in practice. Having nothing to do with the U.S. "zero option," it does not infringe upon the sides' security interests and takes into account the wishes of the West European countries, above all, that a possible accord should embrace all the SS-20 missiles capable of hitting targets on West European territory. So the way to an accord is open in practice. The first step toward freeing the European Continent from nuclear weapons now depends only on the position and the political will of the other side.

The European aspect of the Soviet plan has excited minds on our continent. The novelty, importance, and significance of these proposals have been public recognized in almost all West European capitals. "The questions touched on in the package of Soviet proposals," FRG Foreign Minister H.D. Genscher declared, "not only concern the United States, but equally, and in many cases far more directly, concern Europeans. Recall, for example, the question of medium-range missiles..."

However, the clear and honest idea is being undermined. Citing "U.S. officials," the newspaper NEWSDAY, for example says that the Soviet action is motivated by a desire to "drive a wedge between the United States and its chief allies." And transatlantic sources are used to intimidate West Europeans by claiming that "in the absence of U.S. nuclear missiles Europe will be left to the mercy of the huge Soviet land army" (although, in reality, approximate equilibrium exists between the Warsaw Pact and NATO in this branch of the armed forces). The "argument" is also used that, having liquidated its missiles in the European zone, the Soviet Union could "easily and quickly" transfer them there from the country's distant Asian regions. If we

adopt this logic, then the Americans could even more easily and quickly transfer their Pershing-2's to Western Europe, since they are delivered there by air from the United States even now. What we see here are blatant attempts to use "provisos" to drag out an important matter and bring it to a standstill.

However, we must not delay today. In order to halt the arms race once and for all and shift the course of international events to the path of peaceful development, it is necessary to act, and to act without delay, for everyone to act -- governments, parties, peoples. The proposal to liquidate medium-range missiles in Europe makes it possible to carry out a very important action in this direction and to advance the building of European security.

All conditions now exist on the European Continent for overcoming the disunity between East and West, particularly on questions of security and mutually advantageous cooperation. Europe is perfectly capable of giving its own "European answer" to the challenge of the time.

We would like to hope that Washington will objectively study and weigh the proposal for the liquidation of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles as the first step toward freeing the European continent from nuclear weapons. What is needed is a serious and businesslike reply, in order to begin drawing up the corresponding accord in practice. The peoples of Europe await it and it would benefit world security.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1246

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DUTCH PARTY LEADER ON CRUISE TREATY, ELECTIONS

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 11 Dec 85 p 7

/Article by Second Chamber party leader, Ria Beckers: "Elections Deciding Validity of Cruise Missile Treaty"/

/Text/ A new Second Chamber cannot go back on a possible approval of the treaty on cruise missiles, states Prof Kouwenberg in the NRC HANDELSBLAD of 7 December. When during this cabinet period the lawmaking body decides that the treaty is not in conflict with the Constitution, the book on cruise missiles will be closed for 6 years. In fact, his statement is not correct. In our form of government it is the States General which decides on possible conflict of a treaty with the Constitution. The States General retains this authority after a treaty has been ratified. The possibility of declaring invalid already given approval is mentioned explicitly in the Vienna treaty on the law of treaties. Even though that, of course, could be done only in extreme situations.

In 1979 the Dutch lawmaking body very clearly recorded this authority in the written preparation for the constitutional revision. The CDA party members asked attention to this in case the government, in good faith, does not ask for the approval of a treaty--or in case the law to approve the treaty is adopted by a simple majority--and later the government or parliament concludes that the treaty necessitates deviating from the Constitution. The reaction from the then Minister of the Interior Wiegel was: "Then the treaty will yet--respectively anew--have to be submitted to the States General for approval, which will have to be by qualified majority.

The next question, of course, was how the situation should be regarded in light of international law, if then the required qualified majority was not obtained. The answer: "A lot, if not everything will depend here on the concrete circumstances of the case. Articles 27 and 46 of the Vienna treaty on the law of treaties offer a legal framework. In extreme circumstances the possibility remains of amending the treaty, abrogating it, or amending the Constitution." (The latter, of course, is entirely theoretical after such a statement from the House of Representatives.)

Therefore, the election results on 21 May could really decide the validity of the cruise missile treaty. If yet a motion on its unconstitutionality is adopted--and afterwards the law approving the treaty does not receive a two-thirds majority--the Netherlands has lost its basis for the agreement. It could thereafter declare its approval to be invalid. (It is then as if the agreement never existed, thus the term of notice does not apply.) If the United States contests this decision, the issue of a dispute arises, which could be solved through arbitration or through an amicable settlement. Anyhow, to the United States, which posits that cruise missiles are placed at the request of Europe, an international dispute over this subject will not be appealing.

After this deadlock has come up, another possibility is for the Dutch Government to get into deliberations with the Americans and have the treaty formally remain unimpaired, but not implement it. On Monday Prof Kooymans pointed out this possibility to the Chamber. For the treaty states that the US may place cruise missiles in the Netherlands, not that they have to do it.

Of course, everyone may not like this procedure. Some lawyers point out the danger of the Netherlands losing trust internationally. For: Treaties are to be honored. My answer is that the government and present chamber majority knowingly take this on. In case of doubt regarding the constitutionality, it would be wise to be on the safe side and to ask for a two-thirds majority, the way the government did in 1959 when the European Defense Community was raised.

Test Case

The elections should not be reduced, however, to a referendum on the cruise missile treaty, protests Kouwenberg, this has no place in a form of government. But why not? I would say: the voters will decide. Besides, there is nothing against the political parties promoting it. That is not unjustifiably narrowing down things. The missile resolution proves the concrete unwillingness to stem the arms race.

It is at the same time a test case for a question that should be asked about all aspects of government: do we choose for a society with or without a future? for a law of the jungle or for justice? Whether it concerns armament or social security, the debt problems of the poor countries, the status of women or the policy on foreigners: the schism is an inherent fact. That should be the concern of the elections. Not the tactical wishes of a PvdA/CDA cabinet. Can the PvdA govern while there is construction in Woensdrecht? What was it again Joop den Uyl and Hans van Mierlo said 15 years ago about clarity and political decency?

It is impossible to maintain--as Kouwenberg does--that a national referendum is a metaphorical way for voter participation. It is possible to establish that our representative democracy is badly accessible to the voters. The proposals from the Biesheuvel commission, namely, the binding corrective referendum, could certainly improve that.

Political clarity and more direct influence by the citizens are essential for a better functioning of our parliamentary democracy.

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW NOTES DUTCH PROTESTS CONTINUE AFTER DEPLOYMENT VOTE

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Nov 85 p 4

[Article by V. Antonov: "The Shadow of Nuclear Missiles Over Holland: The Government of R. Lubbers Gave in to U.S. Pressure Without Considering the Will of the People"]

[Text] The Hague. (IZVESTIYA special correspondent). The Dutch prime minister, R. Lubbers, announced that the Dutch government has decided to deploy American cruise missiles on its territory.

This decision was worked out in a meeting of the cabinet of ministers which lasted practically all day. According to the NATO plan to place American first-strike nuclear missile weapons in Western Europe which was confirmed in December 1979, Holland's share will be 48 intermediate-range nuclear missiles which are to be deployed by the end of 1988 at the Woensdrecht Air Force Base.

For a long time the government would not give its final consent to such an imprudent step. Having come up against an unprecedented upsurge in the anti-missile sentiment among the population and local public opinion, last summer the authorities were even forced to postpone the decision on the "Tomahawk" question.

Unprecedented concentrated pressure from overseas and from NATO headquarters was simultaneously applied on Holland for the purpose of forcing it to follow along with its allies on the road of militaristic preparations. The trips here of many American and NATO visitors and calls for "Atlantic solidarity" on the missile question during meetings which have been conducted at all NATO levels over the past few years with one purpose--preventing Holland from dropping out of the North Atlantic bloc's nuclear missile circle. As local observers have noted: In giving the green light to cruise missiles, the right-wing government in power caved in to pressure from Washington and NATO. In other words, no attention was given to the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the population, the opposition parties, labor unions, and social organizations, who spoke out against "the winged death" nor to the concrete initiatives put forth by the Soviet Union in the area of limiting nuclear weapons.

Beginning early Friday morning, the Dutch Radio First Program transmitted a howling siren. These alarm signals regularly broke into reports by speakers and reminded everyone that the government was preparing to make the antisocial decision. All over Holland there was a wave of antimissile demonstrations. More than 100,000 students in 130 cities and towns left classes and went into the streets.

The news that the government had made the decision on cruise missiles created a great deal of agitation among the public and left-wing parties and organizations. In their announcements they stated that the Dutch leadership had taken a dangerous step against the will of the people. At the same time, they reminded everyone that during the recent national popular referendum conducted by the international coordinating committee "No Cruise Missiles" almost 4 million Dutch adults signed the petition addressed to the government and the parliament demanding that American nuclear missiles be refused.

Next week the government's decision on the missiles will be sent to parliament for confirmation. At the same time in parliament, debate has begun on the conditions agreed to with the U.S. for placing American cruise missiles on Dutch territory which appear to the left-wing parties as a gross encroachment on the country's sovereignty and an act which is contrary to its constitution.

Many Dutch people emphasize that the struggle against cruise missiles has not ended. It has been transformed to a new scale. Local observers state that the missile question will be central during the general parliamentary elections scheduled for May 1986 in Holland.

12747

CSO: 5200/1145

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR'S BOGACHEV DECRIES U.S. OBSTACLES TO CW ACCORD

LD241823 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 24 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev

The Soviet Union has advanced new far-going proposals that envisage a total elimination of toxic agents, a barbaric type of weapons of mass annihilation.

Displaying new bold approaches to the solution of the problem of chemical weapons, discarding the outdated "logic" of the arms race, the Soviet side expressed its support not only for the earliest destruction of all stockpiles of toxic agents, but also for the elimination of the industrial base for their production.

At the talks on concluding an effective convention that would ban chemical weapons, conducted for many years, the American side hindered a possible accord by advancing most improbable proposals with regard to verification.

The head of the American delegation to Geneva once said that control over compliance with an agreement on chemical weapons is absolutely necessary, but impossible, thus virtually ruling out the possibility of the U.S. joining any accord.

Later on, the United States advanced a "new concept" of control over compliance. On April 18, 1984, U.S. Vice-President George Bush proposed in Geneva that inspection be applied only to government-owned or controlled chemical factories. What is "new" about the proposal is that inspection be carried out at all chemical enterprises in the Soviet Union, which are state-owned, and only at an insignificant part of the U.S. facilities, an overwhelming majority of which are privately owned. Of course, this "system of control" would enable the United States to violate possible accords with ease.

The latest Soviet programme of banning chemical weapons and destroying the existing stockpiles of such weapons provides, in particular, for the declaration of the location of enterprises producing toxic agents, and for the cessation of their production, for starting developing procedures for destroying the relevant industrial base and proceeding, soon after the convention enters into force, to eliminating the stockpiles of chemical weapons. All these measures would be carried out under strict control including international on-site inspections.

In response to the latest Soviet initiatives, the Pentagon announced that it spent 890,000 dollars on "studies" that would help push through Congress allocations for the development of new American nerve gases. Specially-selected "experts", with the help of this money, came to the conclusion that had been expected from them. They announced that revulsion throughout the world against the possible use of weapons that since long been viewed as immoral and repulsive would be of no particular significance. Reports appeared in the press to the fact that owners of U.S. chemical factories will not agree to inspection of their property, and that this is the chief obstacle in the way of banning chemical weapons.

Washington's reaction cannot but alarm the world public who demand that the U.S. leadership confirm by concrete deeds its pledge, endorsed in the joint Soviet-American statement after the summit meeting in Geneva, to accelerate efforts to conclude an effective and verifiable international convention on a general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of the existing stockpiles of such weapons.

Highly assessing the latest Soviet proposals on banning chemical weapons, the British DAILY TELEGRAPH draws the following conclusion: The chances for success of the talks have never been so good during the past decades.

One can hardly disagree with the conclusion. It is now up to Washington to reciprocate.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1244

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SOVIET TRAINING METHODS AGAINST CHEMICAL WEAPONS

Moscow ZNAMENOSETS in Russian No 9, Sep 85 p 7

[Article by Warrant Officer S. Geraskin, Chemical Instructor, Red Banner Central Asian Military District: "The 'Enemy' Has Used Toxic Agents"]

[Text] In its time the Directorate of the Chief of Chemical Forces for the USSR Ministry of Defense developed a method for conducting exercises in ZOMP [Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction] that is integrated with tactical, marksmanship, engineer and military-medical training. The foremost subunits have already accumulated experience in using this integrated training. Chemical instructor Warrant Officer S. Geraskin tells about the methodological features of this integrated exercise.

Tactical training is the heart of field training for troops and therefore we examined the development of several ZOMP issues during an exercise on the theme "The Squad in the Attack". This is precisely where the squad learns how to operate in modern battle.

A tactical-firing exercise is the the best place for integrated work. It gives sergeants the opportunity of training the squad first individually and then all together in the techniques of completing both individual movements and then operations involving missions and norms.

It is precisely this method that one of the best motorized rifle squad commanders, Sergeant Yu. Pototskiy, uses in the field. Operating in an armored transport as part of a platoon, his subordinates had to kick a defending "enemy" off of an important line.

As usual, in the form-up area soldiers sized up the missions for the battle and worked on combat engineer support for the area. But, as opposed to earlier field goals, in an integrated exercise one training goal is an integral part of another. Pototskiy required that the soldiers have a thorough knowledge foundation for the measures that they carried out. For example, why does a BTR [armored personnel carrier] have to be camouflaged

with a layer of earth to a thickness of half a meter? Isn't a ten-centimeter embankment enough?

BTR driver Private Yu. Leshko had to recall and report on the destructive properties of toxic agents and the means for protecting against them. What came out was that a thin layer of soil would protect a combat vehicle from liquid OV [toxic agent] drops, but it would not protect against aerosols. The tactical exercise scenario exercise did not preclude the "enemy's" use of either type, which meant that foreseeing the danger required that everything be done so as not to subject with personnel or equipment to the effects of OV.

For the sake of the tactics used to carry out the assigned missions, Sergeant Pototskiy conducted a question and answer session to test the soldiers' knowledge of notification signals and the rules for operating upon receipt of them. Since the "enemy" could use OV at any stage of the battle, the squad commander trained his motorized rifle men to don individual protective gear and reminded them of the need to strictly observe intervals and conduct constant reconnaissance.

It is certainly important to teach subordinates how to protect themselves against OV. Yet this is not done simply for their self-protection, but rather to complete the mission -- to knock the "enemy" off of his defensive line under the active influence of toxic agents.

Foreseeing that under these conditions the tempo of the attack and the fire effects on the "enemy" would be somewhat reduced, after studying the terrain Sergeant Pototskiy moved his subordinates' dismount line closer to the forward line of the enemy's defense and set up the firing sectors from the BTR so that every sector could be covered by the duplicating fire of two men. Thus Pototskiy countered the opposing side's plan to use the effects of OV to slow the attackers and reduce their fire activity by tactical ingenuity based on solid knowledge of regulatory requirements, the marksmanship course and the probable enemy's OV characteristics.

The methodology of an integrated exercise envisions the development of protective means against OV integrated into the dynamics of battle. Pototskiy acted correctly when the hypothetical situation "enemy aviation is making a chemical bombing run on the attackers" was introduced at the point where his squad was deploying on the target.

By the hollow sound of the burst (a training simulator smoke grenade ((IDG)) was dropped a significant distance away) the trainees knew that a large caliber bomb that was as a rule filled with combined poisonous materials, either cyanogen chloride or cyanide, had been dropped. The motorized rifle men knew from previous exercises that the all-force gas mask was protection against this and other OV. Therefore when the command "gas" resounded, every soldier was prepared and carried the order out within the allotted time.

Without stopping its observation, the squad rushed forward. The "enemy's" fire effect increased, but as had been established at the form-up area, the

motorized riflemen supported each other in detecting targets and confidently suppressed them.

During the attack another hypothetical situation was introduced: machine-gunner Private S. Salakhov had a partially damaged gas mask and riflemen Privates K. Resh and N. Yurevich had gas masks that were totally inoperable. Salakhov reacted properly. He removed the "damaged" hose and connected the cannister directly to the gas mask. Resh and Yurevich were unable to come up with the proper responses and considered themselves out of action.

After ordering a specific stand-down, the squad commander explained what the trainees' error had been. Cyanogen chloride and cyanide were both liquids that evaporated quickly. In open terrain such as the motorized rifle men were operating in, they evaporated in 10-15 minutes and had no effect on metals and clothing. Enough time had elapsed since the explosion so that the OV concentration in the atmosphere was insignificant and the evening wind assisted in this evaporation. In order to convince the soldiers that the attack could continue, the sergeant ordered that the OV concentration in the air be measured using a VPKhR [military chemical reconnaissance instrument] detector tube. The concentration was less than 0.01 milligrams per liter and from previous exercises the soldiers knew that they could remain in the contaminated zone without masks for an hour with this insignificant dose. This meant that they did not have to stop the attack and was a good lesson not only for Resh and Yurevich, but for all the soldiers in the squad.

While explaining the specific characteristics of other groups of toxic agents, Pototskiy stressed that there were many methods for reliably defending against any "enemy" chemical action and therefore it was possible to carry out the assigned mission.

For example, Private Yu. Nesterov was ordered while wearing a protective suit to take up a firing position in terrain that was contaminated with persistent OV. Knowing the effect that terrain and weather conditions had on the state and dispersal depth of OV vapors, the soldier did not stop to find a ravine or to camouflage himself in tall grass, but took up a comfortable firing position on a hard, stoney out-jut. He knew that the poisonous materials had evaporated and were blown away much faster at this location.

Partial poisonings are possible on the battlefield. Privates N. Noskov and B. Boreyko, under the sergeant's guidance, demonstrated the proper manner for rendering self-aid and first aid. Everyone's attention was focused on how to use the contents of the individual anti-chemical packet (IPP). The use of visual methods was especially valuable, since at later stages of the exercise the motorized riflemen had to operate in all-force protective suits, take antidotes to maintain combat effectiveness and undergo partial decontamination of their skin and weapons.

During the development of the theme "Squad In The Attack, Sergeant Pototskiy succeeded in reaching yet another indicator important for battle. Thanks to the integrated training method, every motorized rifleman experienced a prolonged stay in his gas mask. The skills that they acquired and the physical hardening in conjunction with the increased moral-psychological

qualities allowed the soldiers to successfully carry out the assigned missions at tactical training.

COPYRIGHT: "Znamenosets", 1985

12511/9738

CSO: 5200/1244

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR JOURNAL VIEWS CHEMICAL WEAPONS ARMS RACE

AU212201 Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN Russian No 1, Jan 86 (Signed to Press
19 Dec 85) pp 84-92

[Article by G. Yevgenyev: "Prevention of the Chemical Arms Race Is a Topical Task"]

[Text] In 1985, which was saturated with major jubilees, two memorable dates relating to chemical weapons did not, however, go unnoticed: the 70th anniversary of the use of choking [udushlivyy] and poisonous [yadovityy] gases in war, resorted to by the Kaiser's Germany in 1915, and the 60th anniversary of the signing of the 1925 Geneva Protocol which established an international ban on the use of chemical weapons. They serve as grounds for looking back at the past, for extracting appropriate lessons from it, and for outlining a correct orientation toward the future. It is all the more apposite to do this in the present international situation, where Washington is threatening Europe and the world with wide-scale development of the production of new-general chemical weapons, which is capable of plunging mankind into the maelstrom of a dangerous chemical arms race.

The poisoning and death of hundreds of thousands of people in World War I as a result of the use of poisonous and choking gases displayed in sharp relief the danger of toxic [otravlyayushchiy] chemical agents and the vulnerability to their effect on both troops and in particular the civilian population. The use of toxic gases, which resulted in the incredible suffering and death of a great number of people at the same time, produced such a powerful psychological reaction on the people of that time that a new classification -- that of weapons of mass destruction -- was applied to chemical weapons in the list of armaments. This simultaneously gave strong impetus to the powerful movement of sociopolitical forces in favor of an international ban on toxic chemical agents. However, in the general staffs of the leading imperialist states, the experience of using poisonous gases in World War I stimulated an interest, on the contrary, in perfecting toxic chemical agents. Their position with regard to chemical weapons played a key role in the fact that the 1925 Geneva Protocol banned only the use of toxic chemical substances but not chemical weapons themselves. Moreover, the process of ratification of the protocol by the leading military states was dragged out over long years, and in the case of the United States, over all of 50 years! This circumstance gave rise to fully justified concern by the Soviet Union and the world public about the real intentions of the capitalist countries regarding their use of chemical weapons in case of war. People of the older generation have still not forgotten what a dangerous Damoclean sword was hung over our country by the chemical threat in the prewar years, and what wide-scale measures the party and government were forced to take to prepare the USSR's population for antichemical defense.

The appearance in 1945 of a type of weapon of mass destruction which was many times more powerful -- the atomic and later nuclear weapon -- and in connection with this the rise of the danger of nuclear war which threatened universal destruction naturally focussed the attention of world public opinion on the nuclear problem. But even when set against this background, the chemical threat has not become any less acute. It is well known, for example, that in the sixties and seventies the U.S. Army in Vietnam used a total of more than 100,000 metric tons on chemical agents, including 96,000 metric tons of phytotoxicants and over 7,000 metric tons of toxic agents. The directive of U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger for the years 1985 to 1989 sets the American Armed Forces the task of being ready for "swift use of chemical weapons," while it is proposed that the Air Force and Navy "complete development of new systems of delivering binary chemical weapons to the target."

The United States possesses the largest chemical weapons arsenal in the world. The stocks of super-toxic agents with a nerve-paralysing effect alone amount to 55,000 metric tons in the United States. The total quantity of chemical ammunition for contemporary weapons -- artillery shells, mines, missile warheads, and aerial bombs (over 90 different types altogether) -- come to more than 3 million units.

But even this enormous arsenal still seems to be insufficient for the Washington strategists, who are now campaigning for an even greater buildup of the U.S. chemical arsenal. A program of "wide-scale supply" of new toxic chemical agents to the American Army has been developed which, according to estimates in the press, will lead to almost a doubling of stocks of this silent weapon" -- from 3 million to 5 million units of chemical ammunition -- in the U.S. arsenal.

American military doctrine and the combat instructions for U.S. troops regard chemical weapons first and foremost as a means intended for operational-tactical use in the theater of military operations and primarily for conducting offensive operations, including first-strike use. With the appearance of binary ammunition, Washington strategists have recently begun to assign chemical weapons a strategic role in their existing arsenal of means of waging war. Field Manual FM-100-5 of the U.S. ground forces envisages the use of chemical weapons even at an early stage of a war in order to inflict strikes on ground forces groupings, communications centers, airfields, and so on.

During the military exercises which are regularly conducted in Western Europe, including the recent "Autumn Forge 85" exercises, units and formations of the United States and some other NATO countries regularly work out tasks assuming the use of chemical weapons. Intensive work is being carried out to train specialists capable of using chemical weapons. The United States and its allies are equipping their troops deployed in Europe with new gas-masks, means of permanent skin protection, means of medical treatment, and means of reconnaissance and decontamination.

The matter is not, of course, confined to the above measures to prepare NATO troops for chemical warfare. The armed forces of the North Atlantic bloc in Western Europe have at their disposal a considerable arsenal of chemical ammunition. To be specific, there are large stockpiles of American chemical weapons on the territory of the FRG, in the regions of Mannheim, Hanau, Rhineland-Palatinate, Fischbach, Hesse, and Baden-Wuerttemberg. In those stores alone 4 million liters of highly toxic chemical agents are kept.

he concepts adhered to by the supporters of chemical weapons require constant and uncompromising unmasking. And the primary question which needs to be asked is: how do these persons have the heart to be in favor of chemical weapons? Despite the mountains of nuclear weapons, they are campaigning to add to this a magazine of chemical weapons, which are a barbaric means of mass destruction. They are dragging out discussion of this question in order to prevent a ban on chemical weapons. And when control is mentioned, they advance a thesis at the Geneva negotiations according to which only state plants should be subject to such control. This is a negative position which is once again aimed at braking the achievement of accords.

In conducting a line of forcing ahead the buildup of all types of weapons, the Washington administration attaches great significance to development in the United States of wide-scale production of new varieties of chemical weapons, the so-called binary ammunition.

During the discussion of the U.S. military budget for 1986 the appropriations committee [soglasitelnyy komitet] of Congress, under powerful pressure from the administration, and particularly the Pentagon, recommended that 155 million dollars be allocated for this purpose. What is concretely involved is the production of the Big Eye chemical bomb and the 155 mm artillery shell in binary form. The moment when the decision on wide-scale chemical "rearmament" of the U.S. Armed Forces, announced by President Reagan in February 1982, starts to be implemented is thus drawing closer. One more area of the arms race spiral is thus being opened up, the threat of war is being intensified, and international tension is being aggravated.

Together with the space strike weapons which are being created, intercontinental and submarine-launched ballistic missiles, long-range cruise missiles, and high-precision conventional means of destruction, chemical weapons are expected, according to the designs of the Washington strategists, to ensure that the United States has the military superiority over the Soviet Union for which it is stubbornly striving, in order to dictate its will to other states and peoples.

The program of creating binary chemical weapons in the United States has its roots in the forties, when American specialists were set the definite task of creating chemical ammunition which, while possessing the lethal qualities of unitary ammunition in full measure, would exceed them in convenience of storage, transportation, and safe handling. The need for such ammunition began to be felt even more acutely in the sixties, when the chemical ammunition in American stores began to leak the lethal toxic agents with which they were filled, as a result of long storage periods and damage to the casings as a result of corrosion, leading to the poisoning of maintenance personnel.

Instead of activating efforts to ban chemical weapons and liquidate the stores of them which had been accumulated, the leading circles of the United States set out along the road of forcing ahead work to create binary chemical ammunition. In 1965 the U.S. Air Force patented the design of a binary chemical aerial bomb, and at the end of the sixties the first prototypes of 155 mm artillery chemical shells with a binary charge appeared. In the years that followed the technological production of binary chemical ammunition was worked out and underwent field tests.

Taking into account the research that had been conducted and the newest toxic chemical agents, the task was advanced of renewing and building up the United States' chemical arsenal, although according to American sources the stocks of chemical weapons which

the United States then had at its disposal were more than enough to annihilate the majority of the population of our planet. The Pentagon and its supporters in the administration and congress developed a feverish campaign to re-equip the American Armed Forces with chemical ammunition, requesting the enormous sum of \$10 billion for this purpose. The U.S. chemical program, which is calculated for implementation over a number of years, provides for mass manufacture of binary chemical weapons, for development of new methods of using chemical weapons, and for the construction of storage bases outside the United States for means of chemical warfare.

Facing opposition in Congress to binary chemical weapons, U.S. military circles are trying by all possible means to present these weapons almost as "safer" and even as "humane." Arguments about the supposedly "defensive" orientation of binary chemical weapons, about their purpose of strengthening NATO's "deterrence" potential, and so forth, have come into currency. Such reasoning, however, is designed for the naive.

To be specific, if one is talking about the destructive capability of binary chemical weapons, then it stands to reason that this is determined not by the degree of toxicity of the separated components with which binary ammunition is charged, but by the toxicity of the agent composition formed by these components as a result of the reaction which occurs. For this reason there is no fundamental difference between binary weapons and other types of chemical weapons from a toxicological point of view. Unlike the presently existing unitary or single-component chemical ammunition, which is charged with super-toxic lethal agents ready to cause immediate destruction, binary ammunition is armed with two or more chemical components placed in separate containers. During their flight of binary ammunition -- shells, bombs, or missiles -- to its target, these relatively less toxic components are mixed, resulting in the formation of a highly toxic lethal mixture with a nerve-paralysing effect, such as sarin or vx, and of great destructive power. They represent a serious danger to troops and particularly to the civilian population.

Even in very small quantities binary chemical mixtures, which act on the internal bodily functions and penetrate man's organism, primarily the nervous system, kill or cripple people. Like neutron weapons, binary weapons are designed exclusively to exterminate human forces and the civilian population, leaving material installations untouched.

Wide-scale introduction of binary chemical weapons into the armed forces would undoubtedly widen the potential sphere of use of chemical weapons and influence the military balance of forces; the possibility would arise of inflicting massive strikes on targets to a great depth and over a great area using toxic chemical agents, causing great losses of troops and civilian population to the other side. An increase in the operational-tactical and strategic role of chemical weapons as a result of the introduction of binary weapons into the troops would naturally exert an increasing influence on the balance of military forces as a whole and on the correlation of forces in the individual theaters of military operations. The temptation to use chemical binary weapons to inflict a first strike would increase, and instability in crisis situations would become greater.

At a technical level, the relative simplicity of manufacturing binary compositions makes it possible to set up production of the initial chemical components at commercial enterprises, including those belonging to private firms, transnational chemical corporations, and others, and not necessarily those which produce phosphor-organic compounds. The danger would thus increase of chemical weapons spreading over our planet and appearing in places where they do not presently exist. The U.S. binary program consequently exacerbates and complicates the problem of nonproliferation of chemical weapons.

The difficulties of control over the observance of the convention banning chemical weapons by its signatories are multiplying. As the document of a number of socialist states, which is entitled "Binary Weapons and the Problem of an Effective Ban on Chemical Weapons" and which were submitted to the Disarmament Committee in March 1982, noted on this count, control itself -- both national and especially international -- will become extraordinary difficult, if at all possible, in many cases. Conditions may appear for concealed accumulation and storage of chemicals for binary weapons, and for the creation of chemical weapons under the guise of commercial production.

At the political and diplomatic level, the United States' active preparations for production and deployment of binary chemical ammunition does not increase confidence in American declarations of their interest in putting an end to chemical weapons. They are at odds with the tasks of achieving an international accord on the establishment of a global ban on chemical weapons. Washington's attempts to present its binary weapons plans to public opinion as supposedly "some stimulus" to the Soviet Union to be more obliging at the negotiations on banning chemical weapons are totally absurd.

It is known from the experience of arms limitation negotiations that it is easier to ban a form or type of weapon with which armed forces are not yet armed than to strive for its exclusion from states' arsenals. Having expended large resources on the development of binary chemical weapons, the Pentagon naturally does not wish to renounce them. At the Geneva conference on disarmament, the American side has for more than 3 years been resisting a concrete ban on binary weapons and their basic components, arguing that this can be done within the framework of a ban on the key precursors of any chemical weapons. In other words, they are trying to dissolve the topical problem of a purposeful ban on binary chemical weapons. Neither are the chances increasing for success at the Vienna negotiations on mutual reduction of forces and arms in central Europe, at which the NATO countries have for many years evaded the reduction of any weapons, including chemical weapons.

Washington strategists are planning to deploy the new binary weapons primarily in the FRG, Britain, and Italy. It is planned to also deploy chemical binary aerial bombs of the big eye type on American aircraft carriers based in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean Sea. The Pentagon's plans assign a special place to the FRG, which is increasingly becoming the front-line redoubt of the chemical battalions in Europe. On precisely this territory, the Pentagon plans to create five stockpiles of binary weapons to add to the existing chemical magazines.

The proposed deployment of U.S. chemical binary weapons in a region where the density of military opposition is the highest in the world would threaten to turn Europe into the potential theater of an annihilatory war in which it is logical that the main victim would primarily be the civilian population. Western Europe is thus becoming a double hostage of the Pentagon, first nuclear and now chemical, too. The full danger of the plans of Washington, which in its desire to avert a counterstrike to its own territory, is placing its allies' territories and populations under this threat, is once again shown here.

The road toward radical elimination of the chemical threat to the states and peoples of Europe lies through a global ban on chemical weapons and the liquidation of the accumulated stockpiles of them. Only with the destruction of all chemical arsenals everywhere will it be possible to liquidate the material basis for unleashing a chemical war and avert a dangerous chemical arms race.

The concrete and realistic proposals of which the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries submit to the United Nations and the Geneva Conference on Disarmament are aimed at achieving this main goal of establishing a worldwide ban on chemical weapons. In 1969 they submitted to the United Nations a draft convention on the banning of chemical and bacteriological weapons, and it was only because of the position of the United States, which did not want to part with its nuclear arsenal, that it was not possible to reach a comprehensive ban on both types of weapons of mass destruction even at that stage. Although the international convention signed in 1972 banned only bacteriological (biological) weapons, the efforts of the socialist states transferred the problem of banning chemical weapons to the plane of states' practical policy.

In 1972 the Soviet Union, in conjunction with the other socialist states, submitted a draft convention on the banning of chemical weapons. On its initiative, bilateral-Soviet-American negotiations were held with the aim of preparing a joint initiative for multilateral negotiations on banning this type of weapon of mass destruction. It was of great importance that in 1982 the Soviet Union submitted the document entitled "Basic Premises of the Convention on the Banning of Development, Production, and Accumulation of Stocks of Chemical Weapons, and on Their Destruction," which combined with subsequent Soviet proposals on chemical weapons to serve as a good basis for the development of an international convention on this matter.

Aware of the special danger of binary chemical weapons for the peoples of the world, it was the socialist states which proposed that a precise and clear ban be concretely placed on this type of chemical weapon within the framework of the convention under development.

The active, purposeful position of the Soviet Union and the other states of the socialist community at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament has largely contributed to the fact that work on the international convention has recently shifted to the plane of reaching agreement on its individual propositions and articles. But it remains a fact that despite the many years of negotiations, a universal accord has not yet been achieved because of the obstructionist position occupied by the United States and some of its allies. The United States is in point of fact sabotaging the development of a convention on the total liquidation of chemical weapons by erecting ever more barriers in its path.

It was Washington that in 1980 broke off the bilateral Soviet-American negotiations on the banning of chemical weapons just when progress began to be shown. The draft international convention they submitted in 1984 not only contains no solutions to the controversial questions, but furthermore hardens the U.S. position on questions of control over observance of the future convention. The United States is also objectively braking the work of the conference on disarmament by not accepting the Soviet proposals on the total abandonment of methyl phosphor compounds in commercial industry, these compounds serving as the basis for toxic agents with a nerve-paralysing effect, including the production of binary weapon components. Washington occupies a rigid position on an entire range of other aspects of the convention under development, this in itself attesting to the American side's lack, at the present stage, of the political will or the aspiration to seek mutually acceptable solutions. Finally, Washington's decision to start production of binary chemical weapons makes the negotiations on banning chemical weapons even more complicated.

In these conditions, and taking into account the international situation and the increase in the chemical threat, the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states consider it important that before the task of a global order -- the establishment of a worldwide ban on chemical weapons -- is solved, certain parallel steps should be taken to create zones free of chemical weapons in various regions of the world, and primarily within Europe.

The idea of developing an international accord on the nonproliferation of chemical weapons, which M.S. Gorbachev expressed in October last year, is in accordance with the task of opposing the counteracting of the threat of toxic chemical agents spreading all over the globe. The joint declaration in favor of the universal and total banning and destruction of chemical weapons which was made at the Geneva meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States in November 1985 is also of principled importance. It is important that Washington implements this declaration in practice.

In acting in favor of supplementing the efforts for a global ban on chemical weapons, with partial measures of a regional nature to limit, reduce, and liquidate chemical weapons, the socialist states proceed from the fact that these measures would be simpler to develop and put into practice. They would involve a smaller number of states, and coordinating the measures would not be connected with the solution of many other tasks which inevitably arise in the development of measures of a global order. At the same time, implementing of these measures would reduce the stimuli for creating or acquiring chemical weapons, thus helping to place barriers in the path of the spread of these weapons to places where they do not presently exist, to decrease the risk of chemical war, and to strengthen confidence. More favorable preconditions would thus be created for the conclusion of an international convention on the banning of chemical weapons everywhere by all states. In turn, the experience accumulated in the course of the negotiations for an all-embracing ban on chemical weapons could be used in the development of partial measures.

Taking account of the sum total of the factors dealt with above, all Europeans would undoubtedly profit from the implementation of the proposal advanced by the Warsaw Pact states for ridding Europe of chemical weapons, a proposal which envisages the prohibition of deployment of these weapons in places where they do not exist at present, the freezing, withdrawal, or destruction of existing stocks of chemical weapons, and the renunciation of their production or acquisition by and importation or transfer to states situated within the corresponding territory. A firm barrier would thus be placed in the way of those who are persistently striving to move binary chemical weapons onto the European Continent.

As it attaches great importance to the elimination of the entire class of weapons of mass destruction from European territory, the Soviet Union included the above proposal in the program of confidence-building measures which it advanced at the Stockholm Conference in 1984. This measure is "militarily substantial," as the agreed mandate for the conference envisages. Implementation of it would have a direct, visible, and positive influence on confidence-building, stability, and security in Europe, would contribute to eliminating an important source of tension, and would reduce the danger of armed conflict on European territory.

The new 13 September peace initiative of the GDR and CSSR Governments to create zones free from chemical weapons in Europe follows the course of the proposal by the Warsaw Pact member-states to rid Europe of chemical weapons. In their address to the FRG government, the governments of the GDR and CSSR declared their readiness to conclude an agreement which would lead to the elimination of chemical weapons on the territory of countries situated directly on the borderline between the two military-political alliances, and which could be an important contribution to strengthening security in Europe and to joint efforts aimed at saving Europe from the threat of the use of chemical weapons.

The importance for European peace and security of the creation of zones free from chemical weapons in Europe, and primarily in its central part, on the territories of the GDR, CSSR, and FRG, is obvious. The removal of chemical weapons from this region, which is of key importance in the military-strategic respect and which is unparalleled in the density of military confrontation, as well as the prohibition on deploying new chemical weapons here, would contribute to reducing the level of confrontation and to eliminating the threat of chemical war on our continent, and would provide a real increase in the degree of confidence between states. Such a step would not harm the security of either of the sides, and at the same time it would provide them with undoubted advantages, making it possible to ensure the European states' security at lower armament levels.

The peace initiative of the GDR and CSSR has met with great interest in the European countries. Representatives of different sociopolitical circles justly evaluate it as an important act of goodwill aimed at preventing a chemical arms race and at eliminating the chemical threat and the danger of war. To be specific, the Social-Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] has called on the Government of the FRG to adopt an objective and constructive approach to studying the proposals by the Governments of the GDR and the CSSR to create zones free from chemical weapons in central Europe.

The initiative by the two governments is meeting with support in the USSR. In talks with J. Rau, deputy president of the SPD and prime minister of the land of North Rhine-Westphalia, M. S. Gorbachev stressed that if a zone free from chemical weapons were created in central Europe, the Soviet Union would be ready to guarantee and respect the status of this zone, in accordance with its foreign policy principles. Such a guarantee would come into force if the United States acted likewise. [Footnote 1] (See PRAVDA, 11 September 1985)

It has however, to be stated that the reaction of Washington and Bonn to the initiative of the GDR and CSSR do not attest to their interest in seeking ways of eliminating the chemical threat to the European countries and peoples. Arguments have been set in motion which are not distinguished by their newness, and even less so by their plausibility.

In fact, it is asserted, for example, that the problem of banning chemical weapons cannot, apparently be solved at a regional level. In this connection, American General Rogers, commander of NATO's joint armed forces, calls the idea of zones free from chemical weapons a "bluff." NATO politicians and diplomats allege that there would supposedly be more difficulties involved in a partial solution to this problem than in the solution of it at the global level.

Also advanced against the creation of zones free from chemical weapons in Europe is the absurd thesis according to which regional efforts to eliminate the chemical threat would almost undermine the development under way at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva of an international convention on the banning of chemical weapons and the liquidation of stocks of them on a worldwide scale, which is supposedly what the United States, the FRG, and the other NATO countries are striving for.

Arguments are also advanced according to which, if such a zone were created, chemical weapons which could be used against zone members would remain in a certain region outside the zone's boundaries, chemical weapons which had been withdrawn could easily be replaced in a zone which had been freed from chemical weapons, and so forth. If one proceeds from the presumption of a deliberate violation of a possible accord banning chemical weapons on a regional basis, then possible accords on any arms-limiting and confidence-building measures are essentially placed in doubt.

Also groundless is the assertion that the implementation of the proposal for a zone free from chemical weapons in Europe would weaken the ban on the use of chemical weapons outside the zone's boundaries. After all, it is completely obvious that the removal of chemical weapons from the territory of a number of states cannot weaken the universal obligation banning the use of these weapons according to the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

A thesis is also advanced according to which it is supposedly more difficult to ban chemical weapons in a limited region than to ban them universally. It is known that allegations of the difficulties of control come into currency every time the American side does not want to develop one or another arms limitation accord. Meanwhile an accord banning chemical weapons in a certain zone can of course be controlled, but with the indispensable condition that the sides are ready to negotiate, develop a mutually acceptable agreement, and observe it rigorously.

In the present situation where the United States is striving to move binary chemical weapons onto the European Continent there is an increase in the relevance of the socialist countries' proposal that agreement should be reached on the nondeployment of chemical weapons where they do not exist at present, as an initial step within the framework of the proposal to rid Europe of chemical weapons. Even such an agreement, which it would not be difficult to reach, would provide graphic evidence of the intention of states to move along the road of reducing the danger of military confrontation and of developing steps leading to the salvation of the European peoples from the threat of chemical war.

It is the common task of all honest Europeans not to allow the appearance of chemical binary weapons, and this task must be solved jointly. Whether or not the threat of a chemical arms race is removed from our continent and from the world as a whole depends on their energetic joint actions.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1244

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

AUSTRALIA'S HAYDEN CRITICIZES SUPERPOWERS ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS

BK050200 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0130 GMT 5 Feb 86

[Text] The foreign minister, Mr Hayden, has told the superpowers that they cannot rely on bilateral agreements to solve the problem of chemical weapons. Mr Hayden has also criticized the United Nations Conference on Disarmament in Geneva for failing to deal with the issues it was set up to address.

His criticism was delivered to the conference on his behalf by the Australian ambassador for disarmament, Mr Richard Butler. Mr Hayden said bilateral agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States would be of little use in controlling chemical weapons.

He noted that in their meeting last year, President Reagan and Mr Gorbachev had agreed to intensify their discussions on a chemical weapons ban, but Mr Hayden said this was not enough. What was required was a universal convention involving the participation of all.

The foreign minister also criticized the procedures which had allowed the Geneva conference to continue for 7 years while achieving very little. Mr Hayden suggested the conference should establish a committee to find new ways to prevent nuclear war.

Australia is president of the current session and Mr Hayden said it would use its position to try to overcome the previous lack of success.

/9604

CSO: 5200/4311

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

IRAQI MILITARY SPOKESMAN DENIES USE OF 'CHEMICAL BOMBS'

JN010905 Baghdad INA in Arabic 0840 GMT 1 Feb 86

[Text] Baghdad, 1 Feb (INA) — An authoritative Iraqi military spokesman has denied Iranian claims that Iraq fired chemical bombs in the Area of Al-Muhammarrah [Khorramshahr]. In a statement to INA today, the spokesman said that these claims, contained in the Iranian military communique issued yesterday and broadcast over Tehran radio, are pure lies. The spokesman added that Iraq is well aware why the Iranian Government is spreading these lies, adding that Iraq knows the objectives for which the Iranian side is preparing such claims.

The spokesman warned the Iranian rulers against carrying out any foolhardy action and said that Iraq's decisive reply to such action will negatively affect the Iranian rulers.

Concluding, the spokesman emphasized that the only solution which will always be available to the Iranian rulers is to respond to the call of international public opinion to accept peace. Otherwise, Iraq will continue to enjoy overwhelming superiority in all fields.

/6091

CSO: 5200/4501

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR VIEWS EXPECTATIONS AT MBFR TALKS

Soviet Envoy Addresses Meeting

LD301212 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Vienna, January 30 TASS -- Ambassador Valerian Mikhailov who leads the Soviet delegation to the Vienna talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe spoke today at the opening of the 38th round of the talks. The ambassador stressed that the new round began under special circumstances. He called the attention of the delegates to the statement made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on January 15, 1986 and extending a bold and realistic alternative to the current dangerous development of the international situation.

Touching on the situation at the talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, the head of the Soviet delegation described as a positive phenomenon the fact that Western partners took into consideration in general the proposals made by socialist countries on February 14, 1985 on making initial reduction of Soviet and American troops in central Europe in combination with a subsequent non-increase for a definite period of time of the levels of the armed forces of the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries in that region. It is actually the first time that the general framework of further discussions and certain contours of a possible accord have shown.

However, the proposals made by the NATO countries in reply, the Soviet representative said, still retain a lopsided and unrealistic character in many respects. Their chief shortcoming is that they replace efforts to bring about a real lowering of the level of military confrontation in Central Europe with arbitrarily bloated verification proposals.

A possible agreement in Vienna will, naturally enough, require alongside other things, the adoption of the necessary verification measures which would give both sides a reasonable amount of confidence that the commitments to reduce and not to build up the armed forces and armaments are indeed being honored and that there is no threat to either side. But these measures should come in line with sober realism as well as the substance and character of the agreement, and not cultivate a new source of suspicion and mistrust, Valerian Mikhailov said.

The ambassador expressed the hope that accord would be reached in Vienna both on the substance of the initial agreement and on measures of adequate verification of compliance with it.

Talks Center on Verification

AU301724 Paris AFP in English 1707 GMT 30 Jan 86

[Text] Vienna, Jan 30 (AFP) -- Verification measures dominated the East-West talks on mutual and balanced reduction of forces in central Europe which resumed here today, the negotiators said after a nearly two-hour session. They said the talks hinged on a detailed document on verification measures put forward by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to delegates of the Warsaw Pact countries at the 38th round of MBFR negotiations since 1973.

Dutch Ambassador Jan Hein van de Mortel told the meeting that the 28-page document was complementary to the NATO proposal last December for a reduction of 5,000 U.S. troops and 11,500 Soviet ones in central Europe in the year following the signing of a Vienna accord.

Soviet delegation spokesman Nikolay Neiland said the NATO proposal, which was on the pattern of a Warsaw Pact proposal of February 1985, was "positive," but he termed "exaggerated" the verification measures demanded by the West. NATO proposed on December 5 a series of verification measures ranging from the establishment of permanent control posts to the provision of opportunity for each side to carry out 30 on-the-spot checks annually for the three years following the withdrawal.

Mr. Neiland said a Vienna agreement was possible, but verification measures should be "reasonable." Thirty on-the-spot inspections a year were unacceptable to the Warsaw Pact, he said.

Asked about prospects for a limited agreement before the next summit meeting between President Ronald Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, Mr. Neiland replied: "One must be optimistic and I should like this to be achieved. But I am not firmly convinced of it. We also do not know when this Soviet-American summit will take place and if it will be this year." U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz said recently that his government wanted the summit to take place by next July at the latest, but that Soviet officials had in private expressed preference for a meeting in the autumn.

The current MBFR session will end on March 20 for the Easter holiday.

MBFR Solution 'Taking Shape'

LD301917 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 30 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Willy Brandt, chairman of the Socialist International and leader of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, has just written a major article on the problems of the second phase of the policy of detente in Europe. After making the point that relations between the great powers regarding the ensurance of peace are beginning to change, Brandt indicates that Europe can, and must, make use of this opportunity.

One of these great opportunities is provided by the talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, which resumed in Vienna today. I would like to remind you that these talks, in which both the Warsaw Pact states and the NATO countries are taking part, are now in their 13th year. However, they have not as yet produced any concrete results. Over the years, I have often been in Vienna's Hofburg Palace where the talks are being held. Each time, I witnessed a lengthy and fruitless so-called discussion of numbers. The subject matter was provided by interminable calculations, based on various criteria, of the number of armed forces confronting each other. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries proposed at one of the latest rounds that this pointless pastime be brought, at last, to an end -- especially since a rough parity between the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact and NATO had long been absolutely evident.

Instead of this protracted discussion of numbers, it was suggested that work should begin on examining a concrete program for reducing armed forces and armaments in central Europe. A draft version of this was tabled by us nearly a year ago. It was proposed that, as a first step, the number of Soviet Armed Forces in central Europe should be reduced by 20,000 over a year and the U.S. forces by 13,000. The other participants in the talks -- the GDR, Poland, and Czechoslovakia on the one hand, and Britain, the FRG, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg and Canada on the other -- would undertake, for that time, to freeze their level of armed forces and armaments in that area. That, I repeat, would be the first step. Next, it would be possible to agree on further, even larger reductions in the armed forces and armaments of all the states in central Europe.

'Year Could Be Landmark'

LD291953 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Igor Charikov commentary]

[Text] The present round of talks in Vienna will take place in a qualitatively new situation. It has arisen thanks to the new, constructive action of the Soviet leadership. In his statement of 15 January this year, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed a step-by-step plan for reducing and ultimately, liquidating the arsenals of nuclear weapons. The realistic and large-scale nature of the plan and the concrete ways in which it could be implemented have earned a positive response from the governing circles of a whole series of countries.

It is common knowledge that the new Soviet initiative contains a proposal dealing with conventional weapons and armed forces. The Soviet Union proposes that conventional weapons and armed forces should also be subject to agreed reductions. The signal for the start of movement in this direction, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement indicates, could be given by an accord at the Vienna talks. The talks are now in their 13th year without any visible results, even though the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact states have frequently presented to the West -- that is, to the United States and its allies -- one proposal after another. But the West has rejected all these proposals on various far-fetched pretexts.

On 14 February last year, the socialist countries directly taking part in the Vienna talks tabled a draft of the main points for an agreement on an initial reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States of their land forces and armaments, and on their

subsequent non-enlargement. The document contains practical measures for lowering the military confrontation in the center of Europe. At the end of the last round, the Western side tabled a counterproposal. Now the outlines of a possible decision on reducing Soviet and U.S. forces seem to be taking shape. As for the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries that are members of the Warsaw Pact, they are determined to achieve success at the Vienna talks. If the other side is really seeking the same outcome also, this year could be a landmark for the Vienna talks as well.

Right at the end of the last round of Vienna talks -- it was at the beginning of last December -- the representatives of the NATO countries eventually replied to our proposal. Now the outlines of a possible solution seem to be taking shape. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev points out in his statement, the Soviet Union and our Warsaw Pact allies are determined to achieve success at the Vienna talks. If the other side is really seeking this too, then 1986 could be a landmark for the Vienna talks as well.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1245

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR VIEWS DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE SESSION HELD IN GENEVA

Session Opens

LD041053 Moscow TASS in English 1042 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 4 TASS -- A regular session of the conference on disarmament opened here today. The delegation of 40 states are to consider such important items as nuclear disarmament, an end to nuclear tests, a ban on chemical weapons, etc. The conference, as many participants point out, has gathered in a more favorable atmosphere, which is associated first of all with the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Much attention is being given to the new Soviet proposals which were set out in the January 15 statement of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

In a message to the participants in the session, U.N. Secretary-General Javier Peres de Cuellar has emphasized that by elaborating concrete measures in the field of arms contribution to the International Year of Peace.

Conference Tasks Reviewed

LD031843 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 3 TASS -- TASS Correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reporting: The new Soviet peace initiatives offer a bountiful opportunity for intensifying the work of the Geneva conference on disarmament that is to open its annual session here Tuesday. In the opinion of many observers and experts who monitor the activities of the conference, what is needed now to de-block the mechanism of the negotiations which has been getting nowhere for quite a number of years is a positive response -- first and foremost -- on the part of the United States.

The Geneva conference on disarmament is an important forum engaged in the drafting of treaties and agreements dealing with disarmament and arms limitation. The conference has a permanent membership of 40 states, including eight socialist countries, ten capitalist nations and a big group of neutral and nonaligned states, including India, Mexico, Cuba, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Sweden, Yugoslavia and others. Another important factor is that all the five nuclear-weapon powers -- the United States, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, France and China -- participate in the work of the conference.

For many years now the agenda of the Geneva conference on disarmament has included such issues as the termination of the nuclear arms race in many aspects, the prohibition of chemical and other weapons of mass annihilation, the prevention of nuclear war, the attainment of a general and complete disarmament and from not so long ago -- the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

The group of socialist countries and a number of neutral and nonaligned states have put forward proposals on the entire complex of those issues with a view of devising practical measures to curb the arms race, promote international peace and security. However, progress turns on the reluctance of the United States and its closest NATO allies to conduct serious business-like negotiations.

The 40th session of the United Nations General Assembly urged the participants in the Geneva conference on disarmament to set in motion the process of consideration of all problems of paramount importance, especially taking account of the fact that 1986 has been declared an International Peace Year. The world public hopes that the "Geneva spirit" which made itself felt during the November meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan can and should find its concrete expression in the work of the Geneva conference as well.

Announcing the new wide-scale Soviet peace initiatives aimed at safeguarding peace and improving the international situation Mikhail Gorbachev said in his January 15 statement: "Each state, large or small, socialist or capitalist, has an important contribution to make... no task is more urgent, more noble and humane, than uniting all efforts to achieve this lofty goal."

The participants in the Geneva conference on disarmament can contribute to the fulfillment of that task. The work of the session the first part of which is to last for 12 weeks will demonstrate if they are prepared for that.

USSR Official Cited

PM050957 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report under the "Disarmament" rubric containing interview with B.P. Prokofyev, deputy leader of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Conference: "Defend the Future!" -- First paragraph is TASS introduction]

[Text] Geneva -- A routine session of the Disarmament Conference is beginning work here. We asked counsellor-envoy Boris Pavlovich Prokofyev, deputy leader of the Soviet delegation, to describe the tasks facing the participants in this important international forum.

The routine session of the Disarmament Conference is a very important forum for multilateral talks in the disarmament sphere. This body's uniqueness is determined by the fact that all five nuclear powers are taking part in its work as well as a large group of nonaligned and neutral states. The conference is resuming its activity at a time when the world public's attention is centered on the wide-ranging program of concrete measures aimed at the fundamental improvement of the international situation contained in M.S. Gorbachev's statement. Many of the questions raised in the statement fall within the competence of the Disarmament Conference. Thus, it is very important to comprehensively step up the discussion of those questions and work to reach agreements to limit the arms race in specific spheres. That is the aim of the socialist community countries, which as long ago as the 23 October 1985 statement of the Warsaw Pact leaders in Sofia, stressed the need to increase the effectiveness of the existing multilateral forums, including the Disarmament Conference. It has the necessary potential for that.

The new package of Soviet peace initiatives put forward in M.S. Gorbachev's statement should impart momentum to the talks on all the disarmament questions under examination at the Geneva conference. The Soviet Union's concrete program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world is of particularly great importance. The Disarmament Conference could make its contribution to solving this problem. I should like to stress in particular that the active participation of the non-nuclear countries, including the nonaligned and neutral countries widely represented at the conference, in the discussion of the relevant problems would be of considerable significance for resolving this question. The Soviet Union proposes practical work on the question of preventing the arms race in space and the formulation and implementation of plans for its peaceful exploration through the efforts of all mankind. Preventing the arms race from spreading to space would mean removing an obstacle to the in-depth reduction of nuclear armaments. That is our delegation's position. Our Western partners are familiar with it. It is up to them to reply.

The Soviet proposal on the complete cessation of nuclear weapons tests is also of fundamental significance. This is essential to halt the nuclear race "in time" and create the preconditions for disarmament in this sphere. The task of achieving the complete elimination of chemical weapons occupies an important place in the Soviet arms limitation and disarmament program.

Thus, there are major and important tasks ahead of the Disarmament Conference. The Soviet Union has come to the conference bringing a program of major initiatives offering a real path to limiting the arms race and disarmament. If the other participants also show a business-like and responsible approach and express a readiness for constructive cooperation in the search for mutually acceptable solutions, the conference's work can be marked by fruitful results.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1245

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S., SOVIET STANCES ON TEST MORATORIUM VARY

LD232311 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 23 Jan 86

[Commentary by Georgiy Zubkov, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Even in our everyday life when setting out on something, we contemplate how to begin, we search for the right starting point. And when it is a question of a global matter such as the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons, is it possible to find that very Archimedes' lever which, in the words of Maxim Gorkiy, is capable of turning the whole world to face the sun at once? One such faultless, practical step could be the renunciation of nuclear weapons tests. The Soviet Union has prolonged its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions for another 3 months to the end of March.

For understandable reasons it was far from easy to make this decision. So why did our country do this? Because, as the statement by the Soviet leader puts it, the stakes are too high and the measure of responsibility too great, for us not to try out all the opportunities to influence the position of others by force of example. If the example is supported by Washington, the moratorium will be extended even further. It must become a multilateral act. The Soviet Union is agreeable to any effective methods of verification -- national, international, and even on-site inspection.

But, what about Washington? It seems the White House would prefer not to know that the moratorium has been extended by Moscow, would prefer to shrug off this example. How can one object to such a sensible proposal? In the statements of highly placed officials the thought has even been expressed that the Soviet Union has extended its moratorium because, supposedly, they don't carry out nuclear tests in the first 3 months of the year. So what about the second half of the year? You remember, the Soviet Union introduced its moratorium last summer.

In any case, all these years the United States has been trying to overtake the Soviet Union. At the beginning of 1985 we had carried out 556 nuclear explosions, while in the United States there had been 772; then there were another 7 explosions after our country introduced its unilateral moratorium. Just before the New Year, a nuclear device capable of turning a laser ray into a space weapon was tested in Nevada. No, it is not a question of seasons here, of the time of the year, but of the high responsibility to which the Soviet Union is calling the United States. Our restraint, our persistence, our example -- all this is a call to action.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1247

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA'S ZHUKOV URGES POSITIVE U.S. RESPONSE TO MORATORIUM

PM241717 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Political observer Yuriy Zhukov article under the rubric "On the Moratorium Question":
"It Is Still Not Too Late, But Time Is Short!"]

[Text] The Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions for 3 months has aroused the broadest response throughout the world. It has been received everywhere as a bold new move dictated by a firm resolve to end the nuclear arms race and subsequently, achieve the complete elimination of nuclear armaments.

People are now recalling the situation last summer in which the Soviet Union made its original decision to impose a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions -- this was when the 40th anniversary of the U.S. atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was being marked throughout the world.

On the sorrowful day of remembrance for the victims of the bombings, thousands of people gathered in Hiroshima by the cenotaph bearing the inscription "Rest in peace, this will not happen again!" In 1985 three books containing the names of people killed by the aftereffects of nuclear radiation in the last 40 years were placed in the cenotaph. In a speech at that ceremony Japanese Prime Minister Y. Nakasone called the use of the atomic bomb to annihilate civilians in Hiroshima and Nagasaki a monstrous and barbaric act.

But on the newspaper editorial offices' desks that morning there were telegrams from press agencies in Washington which read:

"According to USA TODAY, White House spokesman Djerejian has stated that 'There is nothing special about this anniversary.'" "President R. Reagan, commenting on the U.S. Administration's decision in August 1945 to drop the atomic bomb, has said: 'I believe it simply ridiculous to say now that it was not necessary to take that decision....'"

These reports shocked public opinion then. Not without reason people expressed the fear that if U.S. leaders consider the use of nuclear weapons for the mass destruction of civilians a normal military operation, what is to be expected from them in the future?

It was only the news that another major nuclear power, the Soviet Union, had imposed a unilateral moratorium on nuclear weapons tests from 6 August 1985 and had urged the United States to join it that aroused the hope everywhere that Washington will finally give thought to the inscription on the Hiroshima cenotaph "This will not happen again!" and that it will then come true.

This hope was strengthened 3 and 1/2 months later when, as a result of the memorable meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Geneva, the Soviet-U.S. joint statement was adopted which said concisely and clearly: "Having discussed the key questions of security, the sides, aware of the special responsibility of the Soviet Union and the United States for the matter of preserving peace, state that nuclear war must never be unleashed and that there can be no winner in it."

But underground explosions continued in the Nevada desert -- that is where the latest types of nuclear weapons were being tested.

As is well known, from the beginning of the nuclear era through the beginning of 1985 the United States, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute's figures, has carried out 772 nuclear tests (as against 556 by the Soviet Union).

In the period that our unilateral moratorium has been in force the number of U.S. tests has increased still further.

It is only natural that Americans are asking the White House boss with increasing frequency and persistence the legitimate question: But surely, if you recognize that nuclear war must not be waged and that it must never be unleashed, why are you doing all this? Why do you so stubbornly refuse to join the Soviet moratorium and begin nuclear test ban talks?

The Americans have not received a sensible answer to these questions. Whereas until recently the White House said that the difficulty was that there were no reliable test monitoring facilities, now, since the Soviet Union proposed a solution to the monitoring question which satisfied even the most critical U.S. skeptics, even that farfetched pretext has gone.

The 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said clearly and concisely: "If the United States ends all nuclear explosions on a mutual basis, the necessary monitoring of the observance of the moratorium will be fully ensured by national technical means as well as by international procedures -- when necessary with on-site inspection. We invite the United States to negotiate on this."

As the British conservative newspaper THE TIMES stated on 17 January, the news of the Soviet Union's 3-month extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions "puts Washington and London in an uncomfortable position." Recalling that Washington and London intend to continue "upgrading" their nuclear warheads and for that reason refuse to end their weapons tests, THE TIMES wrote bitterly: "The USSR's readiness to guarantee on-site inspection has removed what from the Western viewpoint is the most important objection to an accord on the ending of nuclear tests and has put the United States and Britain in an extremely complex position from the moral standpoint."

Indeed, what morality can there be here when U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, immediately after the announcement of the Soviet program to eliminate nuclear weapons by the end of the 20th century and to extend the moratorium on nuclear explosions, stated at a press conference that the Pentagon still intends to "continue tests on a planned basis." That made it clear to everyone that the earlier, much-publicized, hypocritical misgivings about the "insufficient verification guarantee" were utterly false.

In this context, I recall a recent, utterly frank statement by a White House spokesman that the question of monitoring tests "is separate (?) from the question of the moratorium on nuclear explosions" and that the main point is that the "tests conducted by the United States are necessary for confidence in maintaining the effectiveness of our (that is, the American -- Y.Z.) potential," since "nuclear armaments will be a key (!) element of that potential for the foreseeable future."

Even so, that White House spokesman was not telling the whole truth. He omitted the main thing: **THE PENTAGON NEEDS THESE TESTS NOT ONLY TO CHECK THE QUALITY OF THE NEW NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS, BUT ABOVE ALL FOR THE CREATION OF SPACE WEAPONS USING NUCLEAR ENERGY.** [uppercase passage printed in boldface]. This omission is understandable: After all, quite recently the U.S. President was saying that the space weapons conceived by U.S. specialists will be non-nuclear and they will only be used for defensive purposes -- to destroy other people's nuclear missiles.

These soothing reassurances crumbled to dust on 28 December when the seventh underground nuclear test since the announcement of the Soviet moratorium was held 1,800 feet below the Nevada desert. As the U.S. information media have reported, this was a routine test of a space strike system -- an x-ray laser set off by an H-bomb explosion or, in the U.S. specialists' jargon, a "nuclear trigger."

The Pentagon is demanding that its development [razrabotka] be accelerated.

Those are the real reasons why the United States is trying to avoid the ending of nuclear and space arms tests. And no matter how much the U.S. and NATO psychological warfare services try to justify this truly criminal activity by citing the mythical "Soviet threat," they are not succeeding.

People are not blind. Despite this smokescreen they see the essence of the matter increasingly clearly: Namely, that it is only thanks to the restraint and patience of the Soviet Union, which did not yield to any provocations and which extended its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions for a further 3 months, that another realistic chance appeared to halt the disastrous arms race process, which could get out of control at any moment.

The U.S. Administration has been given extra time to weigh the Soviet proposals on the cessation of nuclear explosions and respond to them positively and that is precisely the response expected from Washington throughout the world.

But the time for making decisions does not wait. It must be clear to every sensible person that the Soviet Union will not sit idly by forever, watching while new types of nuclear armaments are targeted on it. It is all the more important that all peace-loving forces urgently commemorate the arrival of Peace Year, proclaimed by the United Nations, with a resolute intensification of the mass struggle for the rapid ending of underground nuclear weapons tests.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1247

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TIME 'RUNNING OUT' FOR MORATORIUM DECISION

LD061636 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 6 Feb 86

["Moratorium on Nuclear Testing -- Time Running Out" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow, February 6 TASS -- TASS commentator Vasilii Kharkov writes: It is now five weeks after the USSR has extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear blasts for another three months.

That decision, dictated by the Soviet Union's unwavering commitment to peace, has been hailed by world public opinion. It has attested to the sincerity and seriousness of the Soviet intentions in the field of disarmament and to the readiness of the USSR to start acting practically as soon as possible to rid mankind of fear of the nuclear threat.

The significance of the Soviet statement that such a moratorium will remain in effect also beyond the announced deadline if the United States also discontinues nuclear testing is hard to overestimate. It is perfectly obvious that if the United States joins the moratorium, this will reliably close the channels for upgrading nuclear arms and developing new kinds of such weapons. In other words, an end to testing is an important practical step on the road to eliminating nuclear weapons.

Over the six months that have passed since the initial decision on the moratorium, in effect from Hiroshima day on August 6, the Soviet Union has strictly honored its unilateral commitment. People all over the world demand that Washington follow the noble example of the USSR and also renounce nuclear explosions.

The renewed Soviet moratorium expires on March 31. But the United States is in no hurry with a reply, although at the summit meeting in Geneva the American side agreed about the need for restraint in the military field.

Having extended its moratorium for another three months, the USSR gave the United States extra time to accept the Soviet initiative. It is natural enough, however, that the Soviet Union cannot display unilateral restraint indefinitely.

Whereas previously the opponents of an end to nuclear explosions claimed the absence of reliable means of verification, now such claims appear just an anachronism.

Should the United States agree to stop all nuclear explosions on a reciprocal basis, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev said in a statement, appropriate verification of compliance with the moratorium would be fully ensured by national technical means as well as through international procedures, including on-site inspections whenever necessary. The Soviet Union invites the United States to reach agreement to this effect.

The declaration of a Soviet-U.S. moratorium, for which there is every possibility given that Washington has the political will for it, would be the best way to start 1986, the International Year of Peace.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1247

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS ASSAILS NEW U.S. ENVOY TO FINLAND FOR ZONE COMMENTS

LD240009 Moscow International Service in Finnish 1530 GMT 23 Jan 86 [Commentary by Aleksandr Gorbunov, TASS correspondent in Helsinki]

[Text] It has long been known that the complicated nature of the statements of a politician is directly comparable with their content. U.S. politicians and diplomats reject this view. Directly or indirectly they fail to hide their irritation when the topic of nuclear-free Scandinavia arises. In this sense Rockwell Schnabel, who assumes the post of U.S. ambassador to Finland in February, was no exception.

In an interview to an AAMULEHTI correspondent in Washington he said that he disagreed with the Finns regarding nuclear-free Scandinavia. He explained the matter as follows: The United States supports the formation of nuclear-free zones in different parts of the world, as in South America, for instance. But in our view nuclear-free Scandinavia brings to nothing the deterrent factor which has been able to prevent the start of a new world war, and thus we do not support such a zone.

Let us now leave the deterrent factor to the diplomat's conscience. Let us look at another matter. The formation of nuclear-free Scandinavia is supported by the broad masses of Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Iceland, by political parties, youth organizations, trade unions, civic organizations and some governments and parliaments. A nuclear-free Scandinavia could become an important contribution to strengthening detente in Europe and to real disarmament, for which a specific and extensive program was recently presented by the Soviet Union. The United States showed once again to the public circles of Finland and the Nordic countries, that, contrary to the Soviet Union, it does not want to give guarantees of not using nuclear weapons against those Nordic countries that participate in such a zone, but that the United States opposes the practical application of Finland's important initiative. Proof of this is the interview with the U.S. diplomat.

In addition to this Washington is trying to force on the public of the Nordic countries its own version of the exceptionally peaceful nature of the SDI of the U.S. Administration. Rockwell Schnabel said in his interview to AAMULEHTI that it is a system that destroys weapons and not people, and that the United States is seeking an opportunity to render nuclear weapons unnecessary and is continuing research in this sphere. Of course,

no one knows anything about the final results of this research. But if there is even the slightest possibility of rendering nuclear weapons obsolete and useless, then it is the duty of the United States, in Schnabel's view, in front of its own people and the world, to make use of this possibility.

While the peoples and most politicians of various countries welcome Mikhail Gorbachev's peace initiatives, Washington has sent to Finland to support its ambassador a delegation led by Assistant Secretary of State [as heard] Allen Holmes. The delegation includes experts from the U.S. State and Defense Departments and the National Security Council. The aim of the visit, arranged hurriedly at the request of the U.S. side, is according to HELSINGIN SANOMAT, to give Finnish citizens and authorities more detailed information about the star war plans. The United States has not given up its attempts to exert pressure on Finland in the question of nuclear-free Scandinavia and the question of creating, testing and deploying space strike weapons, the TASS correspondent notes in conclusion.

/9738

CSO: 5200/2621

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR PAPER EXAMINES PROBLEMS OF NUCLEAR VERIFICATION

PM241553 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 23 Jan 86 p 3

[Article by political observer Vladimir Katin: "Moratorium Is the Path to Disarmament"]

[Excerpt] As is well known, our country does not limit itself to mere calls for the halting of nuclear tests. Last August a decision was adopted to unilaterally halt any nuclear explosions through 31 December 1985. Now the Soviet leadership has extended the moratorium by an additional 3 months, that is through 31 March. This moratorium will operate even longer if the United States also halts nuclear tests. "We propose once more to the United States," M.S. Gorbachev's statement says, "that it join in this undertaking whose importance is obvious to literally everyone in the world."

I want to note in particular the fact that it was far from simple to make the decision to extend the Soviet moratorium. Something else is also clear: The Soviet Union cannot continue to display one-sided restraint in regard to nuclear tests indefinitely. But its degree of responsibility is too great for Moscow not to try every opportunity to influence the position of others by force of example.

The United States excused its refusal to join the moratorium by alleging that nuclear explosions are hard to verify. But these arguments have absolutely no foundation. The Soviet statement especially stresses that verification is not a problem for the Soviet Union. Incidentally, the Soviet Union is not any less interested in effective control than the United States. Here is the opinion of Swedish Prime Minister O. Palme: "The work done by my country's experts in this field convinced me long ago that the scientific and technical knowledge and experience accumulated provide an opportunity for ensuring the necessary verification of compliance with a treaty banning any nuclear weapons tests."

How can verification questions be resolved in practice?

The necessary verification of the observance of the moratorium will be fully ensured by national technical means and with the aid of international procedures. In certain cases on-site inspection can be organized. The Soviet Union is prepared for all these measures and invited the United States to reach honest agreement on them.

The interesting and promising points put forward in a joint message from six states -- Argentina, Mexico, Tanzania, India, Sweden, and Greece -- deserve attention in this connection. In this message they suggested creating special stations on their countries' territories for monitoring the implementation of an accord on ending nuclear weapons tests.

It should be emphasized that the nonaligned countries are suggesting holding consultations with a view to also extending the 1963 Moscow treaty on banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater so as to embrace underground tests which are not covered by the treaty. The Soviet Union also agrees with this proposal.

Incidentally, in the opinion of someone as competent to judge these matters as former CIA Director Colby, the observance of a moratorium on nuclear explosions "could undoubtedly be ensured with the aid of existing national technical means of verification."

I shall dwell on a problem which, it seems to me, must be of interest to readers: What kind of explosions can be picked up by modern equipment, how, and by what means?

The United States right now has 105 seismological stations in 55 countries joined into a global standardized network. These stations are equipped with highly sensitive instruments which ensure a record of the slightest seismic fluctuations.

Here experience and practice attest that there can be no errors or miscalculation in determining the nature of an explosion. Thus, two major U.S. specialists in this field, L. Sykes and (D. Ivernden), noting the high degree of reliability of the U.S. system for verifying nuclear explosions, state that not a single one of the several hundred nuclear explosions in their 20 years of work has been mistaken for an earthquake. They discount any likelihood of an occurrence remaining undetected if all methods at the specialists' disposal are used.

Seismic and hydroacoustic devices located in the seas and oceans can also be used to detect nuclear explosions. The United States also has a network of these devices. Moreover, satellite systems observing the earth's surface can be used for these purposes.

The Soviet Union also possesses the necessary means for detecting nuclear explosions. Last year, for example, Soviet stations recorded a very low-yield underground nuclear explosion which was carried out unannounced in the United States.

Soviet specialists consider that there now exist entirely reliable means in the world to verify whether a country is conducting nuclear tests or not. It is impossible at the present stage of scientific and technological development to deceive or outwit one another. I will give an example. A U.S. public organization, the Council for the Protection of Natural Resources, has distributed a report it prepared on underground nuclear weapons tests which were not announced by the U.S. Administration. The organization maintains that the United States has conducted 18 unannounced nuclear explosions. Virtually all of these explosions were recorded by an observatory operating under the auspices of the Swedish national defense research institute.

As we can see, even unofficial organizations detect the unannounced explosions conducted by the United States. Thus, the developed states are capable of monitoring one another and knowing precisely whether commitments are being fulfilled or not. The whole point is that the United States does not want to enter into an agreement on banning nuclear tests and all manner of means and pretexts about the difficulties of monitoring are being used to somehow justify its reluctance to the world public. In detonating more and more new devices the United States is continuing to pursue the impossible dream of military superiority.

Thus, the solution of the problem of totally banning nuclear weapons tests does not in any way depend on deficiencies or a lack of sophistication in monitoring, but on a lack of political will for this in the United States.

I would like to emphasize here the following fact: Our country resolutely favors the moratorium becoming a bilateral and then, a multilateral act. We also favor the renewal of trilateral talks (involving the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain) on a complete and general ban on nuclear weapons tests. This could be done as early as January.

Thus, in extending its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions and appealing to Washington to follow its example our country is making yet another attempt to save mankind from nuclear catastrophe. Otherwise, the process of military rivalry will snowball and the development of events will become impossible to control.

Our country proposes embarking on the path of sensible, responsible decisions. It is now up to the United States to speak up and act.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1247

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR HITS WASHINGTON'S 'PSYCHOLOGICAL ATTACK' ON NEW ZEALAND

Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Dec 85 p 5

[Article by A. Mozgovoy under the "Commentary" rubric: "Washington's 'Psychological Attack'"]

[Text] The Government of New Zealand approved a bill prohibiting ships with nuclear arms on board from entering the country's ports. This was bad news for Washington. The American administration declared that, in the event that the New Zealand parliament passes the bill, the United States would "almost certainly" abrogate the Pacific Ocean security pact (ANZUS).

The original objective of this military and political alliance, which includes the United States, Australia and New Zealand, was to oppose the revival of Japanese militarism. But the new bloc had hardly come into being when Washington put it on a new track, that of aggression and anticommunist action. Australia and New Zealand were drawn into the wars of the United States against Korea and Indochina. Under the pretext of defending against the "Soviet threat," the United States began to deploy nuclear weapons in the South Pacific. And the Pentagon assigned to New Zealand and Australia the role of forward bases for its ships with nuclear arms on board. American centers for the management of strategic forces appeared there.

But the peoples of the region are not pleased with the role of being Washington's nuclear hostages. "We do not want to die in being saved," noted New Zealand's Prime Minister D. Lange with irony in an interview with the West German journal STERN, "we are not, after all, suicidal."

In February of this year, New Zealand refused to allow the American destroyer "Buchanan" equipped with Asroc nuclear missiles to enter its ports. From that time on, American-New Zealand relations worsened sharply. Washington threatened political and economic sanctions.

Meanwhile, the position of New Zealand has found the support of most of the neighboring states. In addition, last summer 13 countries of the region declared the South Pacific to be a nuclear-free zone.

Washington adopted a policy of hindering the spread of antinuclear attitudes by increasing its anti-Soviet hysteria. The U.S. State Department tasked a

group of specialists with putting together a report on the "penetration of the USSR into the South Pacific region." But this work did not receive wide publicity. Why? The authors of the investigation put the blame for the instability in the region on...the United States and France. "The Government of New Zealand is of the opinion," declared D. Lange in this connection, "that there is no evidence of any attempts by the Soviet Union to establish bases in the South Pacific."

The United States is now doing everything possible to prevent the passage of the law prohibiting American ships with nuclear arms on board from entering New Zealand ports. Angry messages are reaching Washington from the other side of the ocean. This "psychological attack" is intended not only to frighten the authorities of the island country. The NEW YORK TIMES notes that "Washington is afraid that if the United States does not respond to New Zealand decisively enough, then its antinuclear policy may spread to other countries that are allies of the United States." That is what they fear on the banks of the Potomac. But blackmail and threats cannot hinder the striving of people to live under the conditions of a lasting nonnuclear peace.

9746

CSO: 5200/1211

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW: U.S. CONGRESSMEN 'PRESSURING' NEW ZEALAND

LD241839 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Sergey Pravdin commentary]

[Text] REUTER reports that a group of U.S. Congressmen who have just returned from a visit to Wellington and Canberra have spoken in favor of suspending New Zealand's membership of the ANZUS military bloc, of which the United States and Australia are also members. Here is a Mayak commentary. Sergey Pravdin as at the microphone:

This group, comprising 11 members of Congress, was sent by the Washington administration to Wellington with the clear aim of exerting pressure upon New Zealand's government, in connection with its endorsement of the so-called antinuclear law. This law is designed to consolidate in legal form the well-known decision of the New Zealand Government banning port calls by vessels powered by nuclear propulsion units or carrying nuclear weapons. This ban formally applies to any vessel, regardless of the flag it flies. In practice, however, it affects the interests and imperial ambitions of only one country, the United States, since the United States was the initiator in the foundation of the ANZUS bloc, and only U.S. nuclear ships have visited New Zealand ports.

This decision, adopted by the labor Government of New Zealand as far back as last year, in accordance with preelection promises, has elicited Washington's extreme displeasure. High-ranking representatives of the administration, including Shultz, the secretary of State, and Weinberger, the defense secretary, and the master of the White House himself have uttered open threats on several occasions against their junior partner. However, the New Zealand Government has not changed its decision banning visits by nuclear vessels to the country's ports. On the contrary, with other countries of the region it has declared itself in favor of the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. This was seen in Washington as open rebellion, and so a group of influential congressmen was despatched to Wellington with the task of making abundantly clear to New Zealand the dangers of its apostasy.

But this time too, the New Zealand Government did not give in to pressure. Now it is being menaced with expulsion from ANZUS. According to Prime Minister Lange, the overwhelming majority of the New Zealand population considers that the so-called U.S. nuclear umbrella can only bring their country further danger. There can be no question of our changing our antinuclear law, he stressed.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1247

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

NEW ZEALAND TALKS WITH NUCLEAR POWERS ABOUT TO BEGIN

HK050907 Auckland THE NEW ZEALAND HERALD in English 29 Jan 86 p 5

[Text] NZPA-staff, Hong Kong--Talks with nuclear weapons states which begin in China this week are not expected to produce any basic changes to draft protocols on the South Pacific Forum's Nuclear-Free Zone Treaty, according to a senior Australian official in Hong Kong.

"It will be an information-giving and fact-finding exercise," the forum group's leader, Mr David Sadlier, of the Australian Foreign Affairs Ministry, said last night. "We will not be negotiating with officials, but explaining the draft protocols and the treaty."

Mr Sadlier said it was the group's duty to report back to the forum in August any comments by senior officials during the 2-week tour of China, the Soviet Union, France, Britain and the United States.

"If there is a wording somewhere that can be altered to make part of the protocols more acceptable, that could be considered," said Mr Sadlier, who chaired the group which produced the treaty document adopted by forum members in Rarotonga last August.

"But we would not be recommending any fundamental changes to the draft protocols."

As well as material on the dumping of nuclear waste, the treaty says the Pacific states will not acquire nuclear weapons or allow them to be tested or based in their territory. It leaves each member free to decide its own policy on port access.

The group includes officials from Fiji, the Cook Islands, Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands as well as a New Zealand delegate, Mr Chris Beeby, a deputy secretary in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

/9604

CSO: 5200/4312A

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

NORDIC LABOR UNIONS URGE NEW NUCLEAR FREE ZONE CONFERENCE

Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 17 Jan 86 p 7

[Article by Carl Otto Brix]

[Text] The Nordic labor movements want all political parties to participate in the work to make the Nordic countries a nuclear-free zone.

The Nordic Social Democratic Parties and the Nordic labor movements want to unite the forces to carry through new conferences on a Nordic nuclear-free zone. This was decided at a meeting held last Wednesday and Thursday at the headquarters of the Semi-Skilled Workers Union in Copenhagen. Like the conference held last November at Christiansborg, the conferences should preferably comprise all of the parties of the Nordic parliaments.

The meeting is scheduled to take place in Norway, but the deputy chairman of the Norwegian Labor Party, Einar Forde, said yesterday that it will not be possible to hold the meeting this year.

The Social Democratic Parties will exert pressure to have a committee set up of officials to carry through the practical arrangements in connection with the conferences. Foreign Minister Sten Andersson said that the Swedish government has decided to appoint officials for the committee, but the non-socialist governments of Norway and Denmark are reluctant. Sten Andersson will take up the matter with his Nordic colleagues at the ordinary meeting of foreign ministers to be held in April.

The meeting adopted five draft resolutions, among them economic policy resolutions and resolutions condemning South Africa and Turkey.

Anker Jørgensen, chairman of the Danish Social Democratic Party, said that it would not be feasible to criticize all of the countries where human rights were violated. They had, therefore, decided to focus on the apartheid policy pursued in South Africa.

The Nordic policial movements and labor movements will celebrate the centenary of their first meeting by gathering 250 delegates from Sweden, Norway, Finland, Iceland and Denmark at Goteborg next August.

7262

CSO: 5200/2624

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRC OFFICIALS MEET GROUP FOR NUCLEAR-FREE PACIFIC

OW311600 Beijing XINHUA in English 1434 GMT 31 Jan 86

[Text] Beijing, January 31 (XINHUA) -- Representatives of a group working for a South Pacific nuclear free zone left here today after consulting with Chinese officials. Trying to rid that part of the world of nuclear weapons, a delegation from the South Pacific Forum -- which has 13 member countries and regions -- has been meeting with the five nuclear powers.

After its arrival in Beijing on January 28, the delegation, led by group Chairman David Sadpeir, met with officials, including Vice Foreign Ministers Qian Qichen and Zhu Qizhen. According to one Chinese official, the group explained the South Pacific nuclear-free zone treaty and the three draft protocols to the treaty. "The atmosphere was friendly," the official said. The delegation to China included representatives from Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, Papua New Guinea, the Cook Islands and the Solomon Islands.

/6091

CSO: 5200/4026

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

SOUTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE CONSULTATIONS--A mission of Pacific countries, including New Zealand, is to take the South Pacific Forum's nuclear-free-zone treaty to five of the world's major nuclear powers. Foreign Affairs Deputy Secretary (Ces Beeley) says /begin recording/: We are not going to negotiate with them; we're going to listen to their questions and comments, and then what we have to do is report back to the South Pacific Forum, meeting again in August this year, as to whether or not any changes should be made, not to the treaty, which has been finalized, but to the protocols. And then I would expect /words indistinct/. /end recording/ (Ces Beeley) said the mission is to travel to China in 2 weeks and then go to Moscow, Paris, London, and Washington. /Text/ /Wellington Overseas Service in English 2300 GMT 13 Jan 86 HK/ 12228

USSR'S ISRAELYAN TEST BAN--Dispatches from Geneva report the 1st day of work at the Disarmament Conference. Representatives of 40 states are taking part in it. The opening session was addressed by Comrade Israelyan, leader of the Soviet delegation, who stressed that the Soviet Union sees favorable opportunities for overcoming the confrontational trends in international politics and the adoption of specific decisions in disarmament. The Soviet representative drew particular attention to the real possibility of achieving, even in the near future, a solution to the problem of halting nuclear tests. The Soviet Union introduced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions from 6 August 1985. Now we have extended the moratorium until 31 March. If the United States follows the Soviet example, we shall continue to carry out no nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union's initiative has received the broadest approval from many political public circles of the world. They rightly saw in it a real step toward a total cessation of nuclear tests. [From the "International Dairy" program, presented by Viktor Levin] [Excerpt] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 5 Feb 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1247

RELATED ISSUES

USSR COMMISSIONS CONSIDER PARTICIPATION IN 'PEACE YEAR'

Ligachev, Ponomarev Speak

LD202317 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 20 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Foreign Relations Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR held a joint meeting in the Kremlin today to consider the question of the USSR's participation in observing the International Year of Peace.

Taking part in the session were Comrades Ligachev, Ponomarev, Kuznetsov, and Zimyanin. Comrade Ligachev conducted the session. The International Year of Peace, he said, began with a major, epoch-making event — a statement on disarmament issues by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The Soviet Union set forth a number of large-scale initiatives whose implementation would help mankind enter the 21st century amid peace, trust and cooperation, without nuclear and chemical weapons.

Initial world reaction to that statement testifies to the enthusiasm generated by our initiative in wide circles of peace-loving forces. The U.S. Administration acknowledges the importance of the Soviet Union's peace initiatives. But the main thing now is for the acknowledgement of this fact to be followed up with practical actions to strengthen trust and international security. For it is clear to every sober-minded person that the Soviet Union cannot show unilateral restraint forever, including in the issue of halting all nuclear blasts, a moratorium on which has been extended till March 31, 1986.

The peace-loving foreign and domestic policy of the CPSU and of the Soviet state, Comrade Ligachev stressed, is an organic, inviolable unity. The working people of our country understand well that in doing everything through their toil to strengthen the country's economic might, they are at the same time strengthening the international position of the Soviet Union. In our country the start of the International Year of Peace has coincided with a big growth in labor activity and in moral-political upsurge provoked by preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress. The party is going to its congress with the Leninist program of further advancement to communism, of struggle for peace and international security. Our aim, Comrade Ligachev said in conclusion, is to give all-round support and assistance to the holding of the International Year of Peace, to make it a year of important decisions for the benefit of peace and international security.

A report on the USSR's participation in the International Year of Peace was made by Deputy Korniyenko, first deputy foreign minister of the USSR.

Speaking in the debates were Deputies Zhukov, Velikhov, Tereshkova, and others..

In conclusion, Comrade Ponomarev spoke at the session. He stressed that favorable opportunities are not opening up to turn the International Year of Peace into a great year of changes to better international relations.

The participants in the session adopted a statement by the commissions for international affairs of the Soviet of the Union and of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the occasion of the International Year of Peace. The text of the statement is published in the press.

'Text' of Statement

LD202117 Moscow TASS in English 2023 GMT 20 Jan 86

"Statement of Commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet"

[Text] Moscow, January 20 TASS — Follows a full text of the statement of the commissions for foreign affairs of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

"The commissions of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics welcome the decision of the United Nations General Assembly to proclaim the year 1986 an international year of peace and express support for its main aims and programmes.

The world community of states has adopted an important decision meeting the vital interests of peoples. It expresses serious concern with the alarming state of affairs in the world when humanity is faced with the decisive choice between survival and annihilation in nuclear war.

Is it possible to reverse the present dangerous development of world events, to arrest the sliding to nuclear catastrophe? We say firmly: Yes, it is. The summit dialogue that was started has shown the possibility of reaching arrangements if the readiness to act in accordance with the joint Soviet-U.S. statement adopted in Geneva is manifested by both sides. The Soviet Union is vigorously striving for this. The times demand a consistent and steady implementation of the "Geneva spirit" in concrete deeds.

The Soviet Union advanced on January 15 this year the programme of major steps aimed at complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere, of other kinds of mass destruction weapons, at the ending of nuclear tests. This programme of historic importance set out in the statement of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev indicates to the whole world that the Soviet Union is determined to do everything possible to avert nuclear war and save civilisation.

For the first time mankind is proposed a feasible plan of stage-by-stage elimination, within a short historic period, within the next 15 years, of the most destructive weapons creating mortal danger to the very life on earth.

This is precisely why the USSR Supreme Soviet in its address to the United States Congress came out resolutely in support of these cardinal and effective measures that would place a firm barrier to the arms race in space and on earth.

The commissions for foreign affairs of the USSR Supreme Soviet, being deeply aware of the role and responsibility of parliaments in opposing the course at military confrontation, in ensuring durable peace on earth, express the readiness to intensify interparliamentary contacts in these purposes. Political parties and municipal bodies, trade unions and religious organizations, workers in science and culture, women and youth, various trends of the anti-war, anti-nuclear movement also contribute to the cause of peace and dialogue.

It is important that beginning from this year, the year of peace, every subsequent year before the end of the century should become a milestone on the road to complete elimination of nuclear threat. It can and must be achieved that already in the 20th century, humanity should be using nuclear energy in peaceful purposes only.

The implementation of nuclear disarmament everywhere, will, naturally, become possible only provided the creation, testing and deployment of space-strike arms is banned.

We attach special significance to the fact that this year should be marked by the achievement of weighty arrangements on the prevention of an arms race in space.

Space must serve the cause of peace and progress of entire humanity. Such is the will of 150 states, United Nations members, confirmed by the resolution of the General Assembly adopted by their representatives. Such is the will of all peoples on earth.

We can and must press by joint efforts so that the International Year of Peace should go down in the history of humanity as the year of the ending of the arms race and the beginning of drastic arms reductions. By its concrete proposals, and moreover, by its unilateral actions, the Soviet Union has shown that this aim is quite feasible.

The USSR and the USA are called upon to set the beginning to the implementation of the programme of complete elimination of nuclear arms. And their being joined by the other nuclear powers at the second state would make it possible to rid the globe of nuclear arms by the year 2000 and to make their revival impossible.

As a practical step in the context of the programme for nuclear disarmament the Soviet Union announced the extension till March 31, 1986, of the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions introduced on the 40th anniversary of the tragedy of Hiroshima, August 6 last year. The Soviet Union's decision to extend the moratorium gives the United States one more chance to take the road of realism and responsibility.

Nuclear weapon tests must be stopped and then prohibited everywhere — such is the demand of times, the demand of peoples of the whole world. Such is the will of the world community of states that has been manifested convincingly in the United Nations decisions.

The Soviet Union proposes that before the end of the century the world should be rid, alongside nuclear arms, also of other mass destruction weapons, chemical weapons. The talks to adopt an international convention to this effect can and must be concluded shortly, be concluded in a businesslike way, without delays.

Alongside ridding humanity of mass annihilation weapons, the complex of the new Soviet initiative envisages also the restriction of so-called conventional armaments that have at times only slightly less destructive capacity. We suggest to intensify the efforts for the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces for consolidation of confidence-building measures that are adopted at the Vienna talks related to Central Europe and at the Stockholm conference in the framework of the European process.

In order to start a practical advance to a world without arms — without nuclear, chemical weapons, and ultimately, all other weapons, a fresh momentum should be imparted to all links of the mechanism of arms limitation and reduction. First of all, it is certainly necessary to ensure the progress at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva toward achieving their objective endorsed at the summit level — the termination of the arms race on earth and its prevention in space. An added importance is imparted to these talks whose new round opened on January 16, by the fact that the solution of the tasks of the first stage of nuclear disarmament is linked precisely with these talks.

And, finally, it is important to extinguish regional conflicts that are fraught with the most dangerous threat of turning into a universal war. The path to this goal is known. It is the renunciation of interference in internal affairs of states and of the policy of state terrorism, resolution of conflicts by political means, through talks.

Those who refuse to take concrete measures aimed at ensuring peaceful life for entire humanity, who unleash new military ventures and step up the arms race, are defying the United Nations decision on the holding of the International Year of Peace, assume a grave responsibility to humanity.

A new meeting of the leaders of the USSR and the USA is expected in the International Year of Peace. Peoples have a right to hope that the resumed political dialogue of the two biggest powers of the world will not be clouded by relapses to the cold war, by new actions of state terrorism, and will bring important practical solutions connected with the termination of the arms race and consolidation of peace. To promote the achievement of this aim is the primary duty of parliaments, of the public of all states.

In the Soviet Union, the present year coincides with the beginning of the new stage of the implementation of the Leninist foreign policy, of the constructive plans of the country's development uniquely innovative and unprecedented for their scope. These are peaceful plans. The Soviet people are aware that their labour achievements, just as the successes of all socialist countries mean a real contribution to the consolidation of peace and security of peoples. They regard work for the sake of peace to be their duty, a matter of honour and conscience.

The commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet express the hope that all governments, parliaments and peoples will redouble in the current year their efforts for a decisive turn for the better in international affairs. May the International Year of Peace open to humanity the road to peaceful future for all times.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1248

RELATED ISSUES

CAPUTO'S REMARKS ON DISARMAMENT, REACTION

Caputo Speech Reported

LD291745 Moscow TASS in English 1723 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Excerpt] Moscow, January 29 TASS--Peace is an indispensable, the most important condition for relations among states. With the existence of different social systems, the principle of peaceful coexistence is not only the cornerstone of diplomatic relations among states but also the only way for the globe's survival, said Argentina's Minister of Foreign Affairs Dante Mario Caputo speaking at a luncheon here today.

The luncheon was given in his honour by USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

Now that humanity is faced with the burning task of preserving peace on earth, when new horizons open in space, the attempts to turn the earth and outer space into a potential theatre of operations are regarded as extremely irresponsible by entire humanity, the Argentine minister said.

The minister said that the programme of complete disarmament by the year 2000 advanced by the USSR is the most important initiative advanced in this sphere so far.

Press Conference Held

LD292013 Moscow TASS in English 1937 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Excerpt] Moscow, January 29 TASS--Speaking at a press conference at the Press Centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry today, Dante Caputo, Argentina's minister of foreign affairs and religion, highly assessed the results of his talks in Moscow. "My meetings with Soviet leaders were held in an atmosphere of exceptional openness", the minister said. "A constructive dialogue between our countries took place. The talks covered both bilateral relations and international problems".

Answering questions from journalists, Dante Caputo said, specifically, that Argentina views the extension by the Soviet Union of the moratorium on all nuclear explosions till March 31, 1986 as a positive act of great importance.

Dwelling on possible contribution of the countries, signatories to the Delhi declaration, to the achievement of arrangement between the great powers on the question of the complete elimination of nuclear arms, the minister said that meeting of representatives of those countries will shortly be held on that problem.

Dante Caputo condemned the militarisation by Great Britain of the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands and emphasized the dangerousness of such actions not only for Argentina but also for other Latin American states. Setting out Argentina's stand on the crisis situation in Central America, the minister pointed to a recent meeting of representatives of the countries of the Contadora Group and countries of the Contadora support group in Venezuela. In accordance with the document adopted there he declared that the conflict in the Central American region should be made an issue for Latin American peoples alone. Dante Caputo noted that during the talks in Moscow the USSR and Argentina declared against the use of force and threat of force in Central America, for the resolution of all disputed problems in a peaceful way on the basis of the principles of non-interference in internal affairs, respect for the right of peoples to self-determination.

Caputo on 'Immoral' Arms Race

PY311215 Madrid EFE in Spanish 1426 GMT 30 Jan 86

[By Maria Luisa Gonzalez]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 30 Jan (EFE)--Argentine Foreign Minister Dante Caputo charged here today that the arms race, in a world plagued by underdevelopment, illiteracy, and starvation, is "immoral." Caputo, who is paying an official visit to the USSR, on 29 January hosted a press conference in Moscow. The Argentine minister said that the two countries signed economic, scientific, technical, and cultural agreements, and that progress has been made on political issues. The minister stressed that despite the differences between the Argentine and the Soviet social systems, the two countries can try to make progress in the quest for peace and disarmament. He added that his country's stand against the arms race and world tension is "ethical in nature," and that the arms race reflects "an improper use of world resources, which has affected the poor."

Caputo pointed out that he discussed the easing of tensions in his talks with his Soviet counterpart Eduard Shevardnadze and with Andrey Gromyko, the head of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. In this regard, the Argentine foreign minister said Argentina advocates a process of worldwide detente because "the occasional easing of tensions between the two superpowers is not always coupled with a similar process in the developing nations." Caputo emphasized that regional conflicts must remain outside the confrontations between the superpowers because "in no way can such conflicts be considered as bilateral affairs involving the two superpowers alone." He stressed the need to keep the Central American conflict outside the U.S.-Soviet confrontation, adding that the conflict must be "Latin Americanized," although, he said, this stand does not entail rejection of economic aid for the region.

Caputo also gave Andrey Gromyko a letter from President Raul Alfonsin to Mikhail Gorbachev, answering a previous letter Gorbachev sent to Alfonsin describing his disarmament proposals.

President Raul Alfonsin is due to travel to the USSR in the second half of 1986, on a date that has not yet been established. An exposition of Soviet-made products is scheduled to be opened in Argentina in late 1986. Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze also voiced satisfaction with the results of the visit and with the level at which bilateral relations currently stand.

In a speech he delivered after a luncheon honoring Caputo on the afternoon of 30 January, Shevardnadze said that "the USSR and Argentina have set a good example of how to implement a policy of peaceful coexistence and equitable cooperation on the basis of respect for each other's viewpoints, positions, and interests." He concluded by saying that President Alfonsin's upcoming visit "will mark a momentous event in the relations between the two countries, which will be elevated to a higher level."

LA PRENSA Questions Caputo's 'Attitude'

PY050019 Buenos Aires LA PRENSA in Spanish 3 Feb 86 p 6

[Editorial: "Beyond Protocol"]

[Text] To coincide with the 40th anniversary of the resumption of diplomatic relations between Argentina and the USSR, the foreign ministers of the two countries last weekend held several rounds of negotiations during which they expressed agreement regarding their political views on several international problems. These coincidental points of view became obvious a few minutes after the Argentine foreign minister stepped off the plane that brought him to Moscow. Foreign Minister Dante Caputo said then that the recent Soviet initiatives to complete a nuclear disarmament program by the year 2000 is "the most important step" in the disarmament sector, describing it as "in keeping with the point of view of the Argentine Government." In addition to reasserting his pacifist inclinations, host Eduard Shevardnadze took advantage of the opportunity to categorically condemn "the United States actions in Central America" and U.S. policy regarding Nicaragua before expressing support for "a peaceful solution to problems in Central America."

The silence maintained by the visiting dignitary about Shevardnadze's categorical and untimely statements seem to grant them tacit approval, because neither at this time nor in other occasions did Caputo express disagreement with them. On the contrary, the Argentine foreign minister upheld the same attitude when, during a reception, he heard Shevardnadze's renewed attack against the United States for its "efforts to interfere" in Nicaraguan domestic affairs "thus denying it the possibility to independently decide its destiny." According to the Soviet foreign minister, the difficulties that are confronting many countries today are due to "the policies of the majority of capitalist powers" and he added that this policy is blocking the development of international relations "on the basis of equal and fruitful terms."

The imperturbable silence of one of the parties and the aggressive attack by the other against the Western world certainly did not contribute to confirming the widely proclaimed nonparticipation of Argentina in the existing East-West conflict. It is not without reason that the news agency TASS published with irrepressible pleasure that the Soviet-Argentine talks had been carried out in "a friendly atmosphere" and with great cordiality.

The limitations imposed by the formalities of protocol are understandable when these are upheld by all the interlocutors involved. But there were ample opportunities to channel the tone of the negotiations and clearly explain that the Argentine people have not rejected their traditional identification with the democratic way of life or with those nations that uphold it.

/6091

CSO: 5200/2010

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET PAPER ON MILITARY-STRATEGIC PARITY

Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 85 p 2

[Article by L. Korzun, major general of the reserve and candidate of military sciences: "Military-Strategic Parity: Program of Peace and Progress: Theoretical Questions"; first paragraph is MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] "Under no circumstances will the states participating in the Warsaw Pact compromise the security of their peoples. They are not striving to achieve military superiority, but neither will they permit others to have military superiority over them. They are resolutely against the arms race and its escalation and are in favor of a balance of power at the lowest level."

The draft of the new version of the CPSU Program stresses: "The establishment of military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw pact and NATO was a historic achievement of socialism. It strengthened the position of the USSR, the countries of socialism, and all progressive forces and upset the designs of the aggressive forces of imperialism for victory in a world nuclear war."

The profound scientific justification of this conclusion and its great theoretical and practical significance have been confirmed by the 40 years of historical experience of humanity after World War II and are now being confirmed every day.

This experience shows convincingly that the peace-loving course of foreign policy worked out by the CPSU and consistently implemented by the Soviet state has, in combination with the defense capability of our homeland, given the Soviet people and the majority of the population of the planet a peaceful life over the longest period in our century.

It would seem that the results and lessons of World War II would have taught the reactionary and aggressive imperialist forces a lot. Their actions, however, bring to mind the words of the renowned English writer Bernard Shaw: "The only lesson that one can draw from history is that no lessons are drawn from it." Indeed, even such a stern historical lesson was of no value to imperialism.

It is also well known from history that in time much that is hidden becomes evident. Thus, according to the well-known American political scientist A. Cox, as early as 1946, C. Clifford, then an aide to President Truman and later secretary of defense in the administration of President Johnson, put together a document in which he recommended to the head of the Washington administration that he use the "language of military strength" in talking with the Russians, not depend on negotiations for disarmament or the limitation of arms, and "be prepared to wage nuclear and biological war."

Washington has essentially pursued this line without interruption over the course of all of the postwar years. If individual American politicians tried to back off of it even a little bit, their timid efforts were immediately stopped by the forces having the real power in the United States. Their obsession was the achievement of the military superiority of the United States over the USSR and of NATO as a whole over the Warsaw Pact so as to establish their world domination.

This line was especially strengthened with the coming of the Reagan administration to power. He himself called for a future where the American eagle would soar and "America will be the greatest power on earth." And even though the Washington administration, not being able to ignore the universal increase in antiwar and anti-American sentiments, now occasionally proclaims its striving for peace, at the heart of its foreign policy continues to be the emphasis on achieving military superiority and on strength. This was explained quite graphically by the current Secretary of State Shultz, who declared that the United States "must be strong and more than that must be prepared to use...that strength. Americans are sometimes inclined to think that strength and diplomacy are two different alternatives. In reality, however, strength and diplomacy must always hand in hand. Otherwise, we (that is, the United States--L.K.) will not accomplish much in this world...."

Against whom this strength is directed can be judged by the scandalously well-known Pentagon document approved by the president: "Directives for the Development of the Armed Forces in the Years 1984 Through 1988." It sets the task of preparing for a prolonged nuclear war against our country and, with the cynicism inherent in the American military, it points out: "The United States must be victorious in it and have the possibility of forcing the Soviet Union to seek a very rapid end to it under conditions favorable to the United States! For the purpose, the United States must possess forces that in time and after a lengthy conflict will maintain the capability of delivering a heavy blow to the industrial and economic base of the Soviet Union and its allies."

Humanity is already paying a heavy price for the imperial ambitions of the ruling circles of the United States and for the arms race that they have unleashed. It has been calculated that in the postwar period imperialism unleashed more than 200 wars and military conflicts, in which the total losses exceeded 20 million people. Two-thirds of the dead were killed by American weapons and with American participation.

The draft of the new edition of the CPSU Program is quite correct in concluding that the citadel of international reaction is U.S. imperialism.

Precisely it is the primary source of the threat of war. In laying claim to world supremacy, it imperiously declares entire continents to be zones of its "vital interests." As the draft points out, "the greatest crime of imperialism against the peoples is the race of nuclear and other arms of an unprecedented scope. It gives monopolies unheard-of profits.... Monopolies producing arms, the high commanding officers, the state bureaucracy, the ideological apparatus and militarized science, having coalesced into the military-industrial complex, became the most zealous conductors and organizers of the policy of adventurism and aggression."

These are the people who are not at all pleased by the military-strategic parity that now exists in the world. They are the ones who are striving in every way to shift it in their own favor and to achieve a decisive military-strategic advantage.

One can judge the scope of the arms race that they have unleashed by the following facts, for example. In the years 1982 through 1985 alone, according to American data, the U.S. Congress appropriated \$1.019 trillion to the arms race, which exceeds the military appropriations for the preceding 4 years by 79 percent. And in the current five-year period, U.S. military expenditures will exceed \$2 trillion. In fulfilling the will of the military-industrial complex, the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress approved the Pentagon's budget of \$302.5 billion for fiscal year 1986, which immediately exceeds by \$10 billion the "ceiling" of military appropriations in fiscal year 1985.

The nuclear arsenals are increasing in the same giant steps as the military budgets. Whereas in 1970 the U.S. strategic nuclear forces had more than 5,000 nuclear warheads, their number now already exceeds 12,000 and it is planned to bring them up to 20,000 by 1990. Just as intensive are the development and organization of the production of new and increasingly dangerous means of delivering nuclear weapons to targets--such means as the intercontinental ballistic missile, MX and the Midgetmen missiles, the sea-based Trident 2 strategic missiles, the B-1B and ATV strategic bombers--and in Western Europe they are continuing to deploy the Pershing 2 and long-range cruise missiles, which are strategic weapons in relation to the USSR and other Warsaw Pact countries. It is significant that all of these are weapons for an aggressive nuclear first strike.

Reagan's infamous "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) or the "Star Wars" plans, as they have very accurately named this program in the West, are a new and immeasurably dangerous attempt to destroy the existing parity and to achieve military-strategic superiority. And no matter what kind of propaganda screen the U.S. Administration may try to throw up around these plans, they represent still another attempt to achieve military-strategic superiority over the USSR by means of the creation, in addition to other means of aggression, of an antiballistic shield and sword. And if the American military were to be successful in this, then, as historical experience shows, the possibility cannot be excluded that it would be tempted, hiding behind an antiballistic space shield, to deliver a first strike with strategic nuclear and space offensive weapons against the Soviet Union and its allies.

The extent of the striving of the ruling circles of the United States to achieve military-strategic superiority is demonstrated by the fact that in the postwar period they have already come out 95 times as initiators of the creation of the latest arms systems.

Every time the American military-industrial complex and its loyal servants in the administration began to spin a new and even more gigantic spiral in the arms race, they simultaneously dredge up fictions about a "Soviet military threat" and about the supposed "military superiority" of the USSR over the United States and of the Warsaw Pact over NATO, etc. But one need merely look at the facts--and they are a stubborn thing, as everyone knows--and, as they say, not a stone on a stone of these false assertions will remain. If one takes the concept "parity" in its normal sense, it really does exist. But the simple fact is that the Washington administration has its own peculiar, to the say the least, understanding of parity as well as of some agreements signed by the American government such as, for example, the Antiballistic Missile Treaty.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger declared without the slightest doubt: "Approximate parity would be enough but it does not exist. We do not have the advantage that we had in the 1950's and 1960's." That is the heart of the matter. It is not "parity" at all if one side has an advantage over the other.

It is significant that the false position of the secretary of defense (and precisely this, after all, is the basis of the false mass propaganda of the apologists of the arms race) is refuted by none other than the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces, which, in a report to Congress in 1984, drew the conclusion: "At this time, there is approximate nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union." When in the U.S. Senate the chairman of this committee, G. Vessy, was asked if he would trade places with the chairman of the Soviet general staff, he categorically refused. And when asked whether he would agree to trade nuclear potentials with the Soviet Union, C. Weinberger himself responded with a refusal just as categorical. But this is out of the realm of curiosities, even though very serious matters are behind it.

In regard to the assertions of the supposed superiority of the Warsaw Pact over NATO in conventional arms, there is approximate parity here as well, according to testimony of London's Institute of Strategic Studies--very far from being sympathetic to the Soviet Union--in its "Military Balance 1984-1985." The obstinate striving of the United States to achieve military-strategic superiority is accompanied by equally obstinate malevolent anti-Soviet calumny spread not only by the hired propagandists of imperialism but also by officials, right up to the highest level.

The Soviet Union is not striving for strategic superiority. On the contrary, it is persistently seeking an end of the arms race on the earth and the banning of its expansion to space. Another clear manifestation of this is the new large-scale program announced during the visit to France of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the USSR, and put on the table of the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva, a program for the normalization of the

international situation, including, among other proposals, one for the complete prohibition of space weapons and a radical 50-percent reduction of the nuclear weapons of the USSR and the United States that are capable of reaching each other's territory. With such a reduction, both sides would have approximately 6,000 warheads. This will permit the maintenance of the existing military-strategic parity but at a significantly lower level. Instead of giving a clear and definite response to these proposals, the U.S. administration is again resorting to various dodges and slanderous inventions about the Soviet Union.

In regard to the fabrications about the "Soviet military threat," even General Rogers, commander in chief of the joint armed forces of NATO in Europe, declared in an interview given to the WALL STREET JOURNAL on 11 July of this year: "The Russians do not want war. They are patient and careful...." In the light of the entire anti-Soviet Bacchanalia, it is surprising to see such admissions, very rare, to be sure, but frank to the point of cynicism. Precisely they reflect the true situation, however.

In the declaration unanimously adopted at the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the member states of the Warsaw Pact in Sofia in October of this year "For the Elimination of the Nuclear Threat and a Turn for the Better in European and World Affairs," it is emphasized: "Under no circumstances will the member states of the Warsaw Pact compromise the security of their peoples. They are not striving to achieve military superiority, but neither will they permit others to have superiority over them. They are resolutely against the arms race and its escalation and are in favor of the guaranteeing of an equilibrium of forces at the lowest level." This fundamental, consistent, clear and constructive position is distinctly and clearly expressed in the draft of the new edition of the CPSU Program--a program of struggle for peace and progress on earth.

9746

CSO: 5200/1211

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET COMMENTARIES ASSESS RECENT PENTAGON BUDGET PROPOSAL

'Hawks' Influence Apparent

PM051027 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Palladin dispatch: "United States: Dictated by 'Hawks'"]

[Text] Washington -- When the White House submits its draft budget for Fiscal 1987 to Congress next Wednesday, the legislators, in the opinion of the LOS ANGELES TIMES, will be astounded.

The newspaper's Washington office managed to get an advance look at the document compiled by the administration. It provides for an increase in military spending to \$311 billion, that is, \$30 billion more than was allocated in the current fiscal year. The draft budget lays down, in particular, a doubling of funds for the development of a new Midgetman ICBM, the additional production of 21 MX missiles, the resumption of tests of antisatellite weapons despite the legislators' recent ban, and a sharp rise in spending on the creation of the invisible Stealth bomber.

In addition, the White House is requesting \$4.3 billion to accelerate the preparations for "star wars" -- which is more than 50 percent in excess of the appropriations for the current fiscal year. Appropriations for social needs will be cut still further as a result, while military programs continue to be thought of as some kind of "sacred cows."

Another influential newspaper here -- THE BOSTON GLOBE -- regards this as a sign that U.S. foreign policy continues to be dictated by "hawks."

'Staggering Sum' Requested

LD051332 Moscow TASS in English 1316 GMT 5 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 5 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reporting.

Militarization and militarization once again -- this spirit pervades the Pentagon's budget request for 1987 fiscal [as received] and the annual report by U.S. Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger to the U.S. Congress accompanying the request for funds. For the said period the Pentagon requests a staggering sum of 311.6 billion dollars on its needs. This is 33.2 billion, or 11.9 per cent, up on the sum allocated to the Defense Department by the U.S. Congress for the current 1986 fiscal year. Total

military spendings of the United States are even higher than the mentioned sum, as a substantial part of them is "hidden" in the outlays for other departments, notably the Department of Energy, NASA, etc. Since 1981 the Reagan administration has already spent 1.2 trillion dollars on "America's re-armament".

The Pentagon demands that the funds set aside for the implementation of the Strategic Defense Initiative be almost doubled from 2.7 billion to 4.8 billion dollars. At the same time additional billions of dollars are requested for the modernization of the existing systems of strategic nuclear arms and the development and deployment of new ones, including Trident-2 ballistic missiles, MX, Midgetman, cruise missiles, Pershing-2 intermediate-range ballistic missiles and the newest strategic bombers.

This gives lie to the administration's propaganda statements which allege that the "star wars" program nurtured by it is a purely defensive system and that it purportedly leads to the elimination of nuclear arms. Moreover, the Pentagon's report accompanying the request for funds admits that the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) constitutes a new component part and a corner stone of a whole series of changes in the U.S. strategic forces.

What are these changes? Weinberger's report indicates that they aim for a further buildup of offensive strategic arms, while the SDI is to become one of the pillars of the American nuclear "deterrent" for many years to come. In other words, the Pentagon regards the SDI as an inseparable element of efforts to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union.

The Pentagon's budget request and Weinberger's report devote much attention to a numerical increase of the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in and outside the country and to the buildup of conventional armaments. The report says that the use of armed force by the United States is a component element of the present administration's policies aiming to protect the "vital interests" of the United States in the sphere of which the White House includes almost all regions of the world.

All the provisions of the report with the help of which the defense secretary is trying to justify the "need" for a further sharp increase in U.S. military spendings boil down to the trite allegations concerning the "danger" to America coming from the "growing Soviet threat". And of course the report fails to say a single word about the latest Soviet peace initiatives of paramount importance devised to reduce and in the last analysis to eliminate nuclear arms and prevent the militarization of outer space.

'Unprecedented' U.S. Rearmament

LD061054 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0357 GMT 6 Feb 86

[Aleksandr Shalnev report]

[Text] Washington, 6 Feb (TASS) -- President Reagan has presented the draft of U.S. federal budget for fiscal 1987 to Congress. The expenditure side is set at the sum of \$994 billion; income at \$850.4 billion.

The draft reflects the militaristic direction of the Washington administration's foreign policy and the anti-popular essence of its domestic policy. The leading item of expenditure is funds for the further buildup of the arms race. For this purpose the White House has asked Congress for the astronomical sum of \$320.3 billion, which is

being channelled to the budget of the Pentagon as well as the Department of Energy and other departments. This time the record appropriations to the Pentagon are 8.2 percent in excess of current military expenditure. As is made perfectly clear in President Reagan's budget message to Congress, the administration intends to raise them in coming years too.

The draft budget provides for a continuation of the unprecedented program of the so-called "rearmament" of the United States, aimed at Washington's attaining military supremacy and practically securing the potential to realize the so-called doctrine of "neo-globalism;" in other words, interference, including by military means, in the internal affairs of states that are not to the liking of the United States. Particular emphasis in the military programs has been laid on pushing ahead the militarization of space. The most important increase in expenditure in percentage terms is proposed in those articles of the budget that are related to the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," which aims at the development [sozdaniye] and deployment [razvertivaniye] of a large-scale system of anti-missile defense with space based elements. Appropriations for the "star wars" program are being proposed in a record amount -- \$4.8 billion, which is almost double that of the current fiscal year.

The United States plans to continue the arms race on earth too at an accelerated pace. Having referred to the "need to protect the vitally important interests of the United States," the White House is asking for the allocation of major funds for the program of development [sozdaniye] and deployment of [razvertivaniye] of the qualitatively new intercontinental ballistic MX first strike missiles. The White House and the Pentagon also plan a considerable buildup in the arsenals of conventional weapons of the Army, Navy and Air Force of the United States, and to strengthen the potential of the interventionist "Rapid Deployment Force."

Having verbally proclaimed a desire for "a ban on production and stockpiling of chemical weapons," the administration has, however, made provision for fresh appropriations for the development [razrabotka] and production of binary warheads -- a qualitatively new kind of this weapon of mass destruction.

The administration is "compensating" for the unprecedented plans for military buildup, which swallow up the lion's share of the planned budget appropriations, with the latest series of measures of "severe economies." Again to come under the "axe of cuts" are programs in the fields of education, health care, social security, programs which are supposed, albeit in a small way, to make a little easier the lot of American farmers, who are at the moment going through a crisis the like of which has not been seen for many decades.

The 1987 fiscal year deficit, which the administration promised to do away with completely as early as 1983, is planned, according to the draft budget, at a sum of \$144 billion. However, many specialists are predicting that in fact it will be considerably larger.

Joint Chiefs Urge Funding

LD061104 Moscow TASS in English 0826 GMT 6 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 6 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reporting:

The Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces view the entire globe and even the near-earth space as something like America's fief. This is evidenced by an annual report, the United States military posture, financial year 1987, prepared by the Joint

Chiefs of Staff in order to add more substance to the Pentagon's budget request for a staggering 311.6 billion dollars for that year. The document makes frequent mention of such notions as "global interests of the United States," "free access to all seas and oceans and outer space," "accessibility of sources of raw materials," etc.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff demand that the U.S. Congress approve in full the Pentagon's request for funds for the fiscal year 1987. The authors of the report insist on the buildup and modernization of both strategic and conventional armaments of the United States, and on the consolidation of U.S. military presence in Europe, the Middle East, Latin America, South-east Asia, the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian Ocean regions. They also state that the United States should install and strengthen pro-American regimes throughout the world, suppress national-liberation movements and knock together new military alliances under U.S. auspices.

The authors of the report advocate the spending of billions of dollars on improving the mobility of the U.S. Armed Forces through boosting their world-wide air- and sea-lift capabilities, and the expansion of the network of U.S. military, air force and naval bases abroad.

The report prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff along with the report issued by U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger at precisely the same time and resembling the ICS document in spirit, just like the Pentagon's budget requests for the new fiscal year can bear witness to only one thing: paying lip service to the striving for peace and arms control the U.S. Administration in actual fact is fully determined to continue intensifying the lethal arms race both on earth and in outer space in pursuit of the unrealizable dream about U.S. military superiority.

Zholkver Comments

LD062302 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 6 Feb 86

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Vladimir Fadayev; Aleksander Zholkver commentary]

[Text][Fadayev] As we have already reported in our transmissions, following President Reagan's traditional State of the Union message, he submitted the draft budget for the next fiscal year to congress. I shall ask Aleksandr Zholkver, our political observer, to tell us about the main features of the budget bill.

[Zholkver] Let me note first of all that the biggest spending allocation in the draft of the new U.S. budget is military spending. According to Weinberger, the Pentagon chief himself, this amounts to 27 percent of all allocations, and it is to exceed \$311.5 billion. But this figure does not give a full picture of the real scale of U.S. military spending. The point is that such spending comes not just under Pentagon allocations, but also, for instance, under those of the Department of Energy which in the United States is in charge of the production of atomic weapons.

Allocations for nuclear armaments, incidentally, are also extremely substantial in the Pentagon's estimates: billions for the installation of another 21 MX intercontinental missiles, each with 10 nuclear warheads; for the construction of another 5 missile-carrying submarines; the purchase of about another 400 aircraft capable of carrying nuclear weapons; and for the development [razrabotka] of the new "Midgetman" mobile intercontinental missile. At the same time it is also proposed to spend considerable sums of money on equipping the American Army with a considerable quantity of so-called conventional armaments; a further 840 tanks, 870 combat vehicles for use by the infantry, 300 armored personnel carriers, and so on and so forth.

The largest allocations, however, are being earmarked for military space programs. In the next financial year it is proposed to increase them by 75 percent, to almost \$6.5 billion. Over a 5-year period, it is planned to spend a total of 42 billion on "star wars" projects. What do all these truly astronomical figures show? Above all, that for all the peacemaking phrases of the President's State of the Union message, Washington is stubbornly sticking to a policy of continuing and even accelerating the arms race. And this applies not just to next year but also to subsequent years, since many major military programs are designed for a lengthy period of time.

Let me recall, incidentally, that until recently Washington was declaring that the implementation of the military space programs officially termed the Strategic Defense Initiative will make nuclear armaments superfluous. We can now see, however, that it is planned to build up both the one and the other, both space and atomic weapons.

This is being pointed out by the very United States' congressmen who are going to be considering the federal budget. They also note that it provides for a further increase of military spending, while at the same time envisaging further reductions in allocations for the most essential social program. And last but not least, there is another circumstance, pointed out by Senator Mitchell, among others. We cannot allow ourselves to increase military spending limitlessly, and at the same time to try to balance the budget, he said. The country is living on borrowed money and the moment is not far off when the bill for this will have to be met.

Let me add that not only the Americans but also the whole of humanity is having to foot the bill for the unrestrained arms race, which brings fabulous profits only to the manufacturers of death.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1248

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S 2 FEBRUARY WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD022035 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 2 Feb 86

["International Observers Roundtable" with Rudolf Georgiyevich Kolchanov, deputy editor in chief of TRUD' Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Lebedev, deputy editor in chief of MIROVAYA IKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA: and Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, political correspondent for Central Television and All-Union Radio]

Stockholm Conference, MBFR Talks

[Excerpt] [Zholkver] Hello comrades! The response to the wide-scale peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, which have been set forth in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement, is continuing to come in from many countries. The response from the European countries is particularly great. I saw a lengthy article by Willy Brandt, chairman of Socialist International and leader of German Social Democratic Party, on the problems, as he expressed himself, in the second phase of the detente policy in Europe. Noting that relations between the superpowers--the Soviet Union and the United States--as far as securing peace is concerned are beginning to change, Brandt points to the fact that Europe can and must use this chance. It has to be said that the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe, represents one such major opportunity. It renewed its work in the Swedish capital last week. As far as I am aware, you, Rudolf Georgiyevich happened to be in Stockholm. What is the situation there now?

[Kolchanov] Yes, I happened to be at the Stockholm conference. True, not very recently, about 7 or 8 months ago, but I naturally continue to follow the proceedings of this conference and I will gladly share my views. First of all, I would like to say that the words which you just quoted, Brandt's words -- Europe can and must -- are of high significance. Indeed, Europe can; after Helsinki Europe has proved what it can do. During this decade, the political contacts, including the top level ones, have become far broader, the economic and scientific and technological contacts between the states with different social system have broadened; cultural, sports, trade union exchanges and so on have become wider. This means that Europe has demonstrated what it can do.

[Zholkver] It was not just by chance that Mikhail Sergeyevich called Europe the construction site for detente.

[Kolchanov] The construction site for detente -- it can and must do a lot. It has to because this region and this continent possess a special place both in the history of mankind and in the present international situation. I, too, would like to quote the words of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, voiced by him at the dinner given in honor of the Italian Communist Party delegation. It is notably here on this continent, said Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, where, as we see it, there now exist all the conditions for overcoming the alienation between East and West, especially as far as the issues of security and mutually advantageous cooperation are concerned. Thus, one of the factors that must assist in overcoming this alienation, in getting cooperation under way, in strengthening security on our continent is undoubtedly the Stockholm conference.

Two years have passed since the start of work of this conference in which 33 European states plus the United States and Canada are participating. These are the states that signed the Final Act in Helsinki. The aim of this conference follows from its title: to achieve an accord on confidence building measures, security and disarmament in Europe.

At the start, much skepticism was expressed by Western media in relation to the slow pace of the proceeding, to the virtual absence of any kind of accord and so on. Indeed, difficulties did exist, because very serious issues were being discussed. Nevertheless, progress is now noticeable.

The socialist countries are waging a persistent struggle in order to achieve much greater progress. Notably our countries have made proposals which envisage specific undertakings on the non-use of force and specific measures for strengthening confidence in the military sphere. The most complex issue on the Stockholm conference agenda is the issue about notification concerning large ground forces, and air exercises. However, without its solution, confidence in Europe cannot be strengthened. Despite the serious character of these issues, here too, it is possible to find a solution to this problem. This, in particular, is mentioned in Comrade Gorbachev's declaration. If a complex solution to the issues outlined by him proves impossible, then Mikhail Sergeyevich's question is: Why not seek their solution in stages?

For instance we could achieve an accord now on notification about major exercises of ground and air forces and transfer the issue of naval activity to the next round of the conference. This means that our present approach to Stockholm is an attempt to achieve results on some particular issues. The main thing required from the Stockholm conference is to call upon it to place barriers in the path of using force and concealed preparation for war, either on land, on sea, or in the air. We want specific undertakings on averting use of force and specific undertakings on confidence building measures.

[Zholkver] It is clear that the reduction of armaments represents the most important confidence building measure. These issues are on the agenda of other talks, which were also renewed last week. These are the talks in Vienna on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. These talks have been going on much longer than the Stockholm talks. They are in their 13th year. However, so far, they have not yielded any specific results. Many times I happened to be in the Hofburg palace in Vienna, where these talks, attended by the Warsaw Pact states as well as by the NATO countries, are being held. Every time I witnessed a protracted, fruitless so-called numerical discussion. Endless calculations of the strengths of the opposing armed forces, which were based on various kinds of criteria, were discussed.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have proposed at one of the latest rounds of the talks to finally put an end to this aimless exercise. The more so because the rough parity between the Warsaw Pact and NATO armed forces has been evident for a very long time. And so, instead of lingering on with this numerical discussion, it was proposed to examine a specific program for reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. Such a proposal was made by ourselves, about a year ago. It was proposed as a first step to reduce the number of the Soviet Armed Forces in central Europe by 20,000 and the U.S. forces by 13,000 in the course of the year. And other participants in the talks -- the NATO countries as well as Warsaw Pact countries -- would undertake to freeze the level of their armed forces and armaments for this period, for this year. This would be, as I have already said, the first step and then it would be possible to negotiate further and more major reductions of armed forces and armaments by all states in central Europe.

At the very end of the last round of the Viennese talks, this was at the beginning of December last year, the NATO countries' representatives apparently answered our proposals. Now, an outline for a possible solution is appearing. In any case, I saw on the pages of the Viennese paper KURIER the opinion, that for the first time there exist justified hopes for progress in the Viennese talks.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's declaration stresses that the Soviet Union and our allies are filled with the will to achieve success at the Viennese talks.

[Kolchanov] Aleksandr Vladimirovich, Western powers have been putting the cart before the horse for a long time in Vienna by talking constantly about monitoring and not negotiating the subject which was to be monitored. We have been accused supposedly of avoiding monitoring. Now, in my opinion, Western politicians are finding that even putting the cart before the horse is very awkward, because we made a declaration about any kind of control, sensible control, if of course there is essentially an accord.

[Zholkver] Yes, we are by no means less interested in monitoring than the Americans.

[Lebedev] If you will allow me.

[Zholkver] Yes, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich.

[Lebedev] I would like to join in your discussion about Vienna in particular. Of course, the impulse which has been provided by the new Soviet proposals made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is immense, and what's more it can be applied to the Vienna talks. Clearly it is a good thing when a fairly solid British newspaper like the FINANCIAL TIMES writes that the talks on mutual armed forces and armaments reductions in central Europe are being resumed in Vienna in an optimistic atmosphere of a kind that has not existed here for many years. Furthermore, the author of the article links this directly with the set of major initiatives of the Soviet Union, and does so in an attempt to find some similarity, so to speak, with the proposals of Western countries. Well, thank God for that!

[Kolchanov] Fair enough. Fair enough.

[Lebedev] It's very good, because this is what our ideas are aimed at. Of course, there are other ideas here, too, which play no small part. They have been proposed in part by our country; in many cases, if one takes a historical view of things, they have also been proposed by other European states. Like, for example, the idea of declaring nuclear-free zones. It is clear that by itself of course this initiative does not solve the problem of ending the nuclear arms race, but without a doubt it would exert a restraining influence. Overall, this is not a new idea. Way back in the 1950's, Poland proposed a nuclear-free zone plan for central Europe, the Rapacki plan. We also know about the initiative of the former Finnish President Kekkonen concerning the creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe. All these initiatives have been supported by our country, which has pledged its willingness to serve as one of the guarantors of the observance of these nuclear-free zones. This idea gained force very rapidly and won an increasing number of supporters.

Later, the initiative to make the Balkans a nuclear-free zone took shape: It is being advanced actively by Bulgaria, Greece and a number of other countries on the Balkan peninsula. In addition, people know about the proposal which has also been supported by our country and the Warsaw Pact countries about setting up a nuclear-free corridor, so to speak, along the borders of the two alliances, the Warsaw Pact and NATO. In short, in its different versions, so to speak, this idea, too, which is very important, has now gone beyond the strictly European scale. And indeed this is not just an idea. It is already reality, and if one considers the Tlateloco treaty for instance, the treaty banning nuclear weapons in Latin America, essentially this already declares Latin America to be a nuclear-free zone. This treaty is in force. Furthermore, although this is not a very thickly populated part of the globe of course, the Antarctic Continent has also been declared to be a zone where military activity is ruled and forbidden.

Recently a group of states in the southern Pacific; Australia, New Zealand and a number of smaller ones, also declared enormous expanses of the southern part of the Pacific Ocean to be a nuclear-free zone.

All this fits in precisely with the ideas that have now been put forward by our leadership. And at the same time, if you will allow me to go, because I don't want us to get carried off into other topics and perhaps leave out a very important part of our proposals -- the point is to rid mankind by the year 2000 both of nuclear weapons. This is very important and it is something that could be achieved, I won't say easily, but relatively quickly given the fact that this problem has been worked on during the preceding period, during the years 1976-1980, when Soviet-U.S. talks took place on working out a convention to ban chemical weapons.

Challenger Tragedy

[Zholkver] Well, I think we can now move on to another aspect of our proposals which is of no less importance, the space aspect. I have to say that this problem, literally over the past few days, has acquired a new, I would say, dramatic aspect in connection with the disaster that befell the U.S. space shuttle Challenger. The causes of this accident have not yet been established, although search groups and numerous commissions of experts are engaged in this. Some of them recall that the launch of the Challenger, and before that, the launch of the Columbia, another similar ship, were postponed repeatedly because of malfunctions of various kinds. There was not always sufficient time left to remove these because the launches followed one after another. In this connection, there is an interesting report from a correspondent of the U.S. CBS tele-

vision company who is accredited to the Pentagon. He stated that NASA, the American space administration, is not keeping up with the requirements of its main clients, the military clients, who are continuing research in the SDI field, the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative.

[Kolchanov] Aleksandr Vladimirovich, this failure to keep up might result in new tragedies. Let me quote a statement made quite recently at the Detroit Economics Club by Defense Secretary Weinberger. According to Weinberger, continuing work within the "star wars" program is now one of the main priorities of the U.S. Administration, and Weinberger called directly for the creation of a new space shuttle.

[Lebedev] Yes, and on this very issue I would like to share my own, simply human, feelings in connection with the Challenger tragedy, and with the simply surprising, I would say indecent, haste with which very highly-placed U.S. officials immediately began to say no, no, no, this disaster, this tragedy, will in no way affect any of the plans linked with the implementation of this so-called SDI program and so on, although....

[Kolchanov, interrupting] You no doubt have in mind the statement that was made by Abrahamson.

[Lebedev] And by Weinberger and...

[Zholkver, interrupting] Yes, literally hours after the disaster there was a meeting between Abrahamson and leading figures in the U.S. Congress and he stated that we must not permit this tragedy to hinder implementation of SDI plans.

[Kolchanov] Yes, that's an exact, direct, quote from him, not permit.

[Lebedev] In this kind of situation, you know, questions of decency and morals do arise, but let us leave those to one side for a moment and think about the common-sense aspect, the issue that can never be left outside the brackets. Throughout this entire recent episode we have observed the astonishing arrogance and even, I venture to say, the conceit with which various U.S. officials have talked about there being no problems, no serious technological problems, which would prevent the implementation of all these programs for putting up space strike weapons. It's an astonishing confidence in the superiority of U.S. technology. They can do it all, it's all possible and it's all within their capabilities, so to speak. Now we see, in the example of just one single flight, that these much-vaunted computers have not shown any defectiveness at any stage, right up to the time of the explosion. The American specialists themselves point out that with the deployment of space armaments, the computers will have to carry out tens of millions and up to hundreds of millions of operations.

I will allow myself once again on the human side to ask this question. Surely this tragedy must have taught something, in this sense, to those who are rushing into space with weapons? In general terms, I read something that might reply to this question in THE NEW YORK TIMES. Reston writes that after the disaster Washington figures from both political parties began to realize that they are dealing with weapons which are capable of blowing up the world and which they will not always be able to control. This, the observer writes, is the gloomy lesson of the tragedy that took place in the sky over Florida. God forbid that these victims lost their lives in vain; may the right conclusion be drawn.

[Zholkver] It has to be said that it is not just in the United States that they are drawing this conclusion or beginning to do so. We have been talking a lot about Europe today and that is quite natural. I have seen, for example, a statement by Karsten Voigt, a prominent FRG politician, a Social Democrat and an expert in disarmament and security. He stated directly that the Challenger disaster must become the grounds for a reexamination of attitudes toward the "star wars" plans and the plans for implementing the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative. It is interesting that quite different newspapers have commented in exactly the same tone, almost identically: newspapers like the British THE GUARDIAN and the French LIBERATION. They also say what you were saying, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, that it is impossible to rely on computers, especially when it's going to be a question of creating a gigantic space shield or space sword, and that the danger and the threat have now been demonstrated particularly vividly.

At the same time, however, I would also like to mention something else. Yes, the United States has been shaken by all of this. But there have been shocks of a different kind. What have U.S. news agencies been noting at this time? The fall in the prices of shares in companies like Rockwell International, Lockheed, Morton and Martin Marietta. All these are companies engaged in the production of space weapons. What is worrying them more than anything else now is the question of whether they are going to lose military orders because of this, the military orders that have already been announced by the Pentagon, 550 contracts for the current year, and a further 150 contracts -- just for space weapons -- for next year, already planned. It is expected that 17 billion dollars will be spent on these contracts alone up to the year 1989.

[Kolchanov] To judge from the statements by U.S. politicians, military-industrial corporations -- in particular those mentioned by you, Aleksandr Vladimirovich -- have no need to worry about the fate of their profits.

[Zholkver] But you know, Rudolf Georgiyevich, I think it should be noted that the concerns we have named are, of course, the biggest sharks in that world, but both they and the others are making a fortune out of producing not only space and not just nuclear weapons, but by producing conventional weapons as well. Furthermore, the weapons are delivered not only to the U.S. Army but also to numerous military outfits in other countries, U.S. mercenary outfits.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1248

RELATED ISSUES

USSR ACADEMICIAN VELIKHOV EVALUATES CONSEQUENCES OF NUCLEAR WAR

PM301427 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Jan 86 p 14

[Article by Academician Ye. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "A Global Ecological Disaster" -- first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The book "The Night After..." ["Noch Posle..."] has been prepared by the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, a nongovernmental national organization set up in May 1983. It is headed by Academician Ye. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Commenting on the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee he said: "Today it is clear to everyone living on earth that we are at a critical stage in our history, when the question of whether we have a future is being decided. Whether mankind's history continues or whether it ends with us, depends on our generation. The point is that scientists and military experts are well aware that mankind and nuclear weapons cannot coexist permanently. Either -- or. There is no third way. Therefore, the constructive new proposals on the elimination of nuclear weapons put forward by the Soviet leader are a program for all mankind."

Today we offer for the attention of readers some reflections by scientists who took part in the preparation of this book ("Mir" Publishing House).

Ten or fifteen years ago, when people talked about nuclear war, it was noted that it would lead to the death of hundreds of millions of people and unprecedented devastation. Now it has become obvious that its consequences -- a global ecological disaster -- would mean the death of civilization. In effect it is a question of the continued existence of the human race and even of life on earth itself. That conclusion was formulated for the first time by scientists from various countries in early 1983 and it became known to the broad world public at the international conference on "The World After Nuclear War" held in Washington in October-November of that year. The scientists reached this conviction not only on the basis of their own scientific research, but also as a result of highly detailed, objective checking and comprehensive discussion of the possible consequences with colleagues at various international seminars, symposiums, and conferences.

The essence of the scientific warnings can be set forth in brief as follows. Nuclear explosions will cause mass conflagrations accompanied by the discharge into the atmosphere of a huge quantity of combustion products -- soot, ash, and toxic gases. Clouds consisting of tiny particles will absorb and disperse the sunlight, darkening the surface of the earth. The so-called nuclear night will set in; the radiation balance of the entire planet will be disrupted; and the temperature of its surface will fall

in the course of a few days by approximately 30-50 degrees compared with the normal temperature for the time of year. As a result of the radical restructuring of the system of movement of air masses in the atmosphere, in a matter of a few weeks an unprecedented climatic catastrophe will spread over the entire planet, causing the mass destruction of flora and fauna.

Having acknowledged the correct, substantiated nature of the scientists' concern, it is necessary to take the next step -- to exclude the prospect of global climatic catastrophe associated with the first nuclear strike. Yet the United States has never renounced the possibility of being the first to use nuclear weapons, which is the pivot of all U.S. political and military doctrine. Soviet military doctrine does not include the concept of preemptive strikes, but is of a purely defensive nature.

The Soviet Union regards a nuclear attack as the gravest crime against mankind. The top Soviet leaders have noted repeatedly that counting on victory in a nuclear war is dangerous madness. Only someone who has decided to commit suicide could start such a war in the hope of emerging victorious.

In the past, in the first decades of the nuclear and space age, when international relations were dominated by the principle of military force, the concept of national security was associated with the quantitative accumulation and qualitative improvement of weapons. Of course, the arms race was regarded as an evil, but a necessary evil arising from existing international contradictions. However, today the continuation of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, not only exacerbates the situation in the world in general, but at the same time threatens various countries' national security. "The paradox of the nuclear age" is that the stockpiling and improvement of nuclear weapons constantly increases the danger: By virtue of a military-political miscalculation or adventurist militarist aspirations or simply because of some technical defect in sophisticated systems, these weapons could be used.

The scientists research which showed us the picture of the "nuclear winter" show to a still greater degree that the military force approach to the resolution of political problems is absolutely unacceptable. Modern weapons of mass destruction are weapons of collective suicide, not a "more effective means of conducting military operations." All countries and peoples must unite to resolve together the problem of the final renunciation of weapons of this type. Of course, this is a long and difficult path, but it is necessary to start moving in the right direction as soon as possible. This movement in itself will improve the international situation.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1248

RELATED ISSUES

BRIEFS

GOALS OF GENEVA DISARMAMENT MEETING--Australia is to hold the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva for the first month of the 1986 session beginning this month. The international conference was set up in 1978 as a multilateral body to negotiate disarmament and arms control agreement. Australia's Foreign Affairs Minister Mr Hayden says Australia will seek to resolve some of the procedural problems which have so far hindered the work of the conference. He also said Australia attached special priority to the negotiation of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty and a new convention to outlaw chemical weapons. There are 40 member countries in the conference, including the five nuclear powers of the United States, China, the Soviet Union, Britain, and France. Mr Hayden said the work of the conference on disarmament was complementary to what might be achieved on a bilateral level between the United States and the Soviet Union. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 2 Feb 86] /9604

CSO: 5200/4312

END